Daily Report

Near East & South Asia

FBIS-NES-93-184
Friday
24 September 1993

Daily Report
Near East & South Asia

FBIS-NES-93-184 24 September 1993

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Palestinian Affairs

'Arafat Adviser on Post-Accord Plans, Issues *[London AL-HAYAH 20 Sep]* 1
'Abd-Rabbuh Comments on Knesset Vote on Accord *[Tel Aviv Radio]* 2
'Abd-Rabbuh on Amman Talks, Gaza-Jericho Pact *[Amman TV]* 2
PLO Envoy Denies Closure of Baghdad Offices *[London AL-SHARQ AL-AWSAT 21 Sep]* 7
PRC Reportage on 'Arafat Visit *[cross-reference]* 7

ARAB AFRICA

Algeria

Ali Kafi Addresses Council of Ministers on Tasks *[Algiers TV]* 8

Egypt

Musa Details Official Talks With Christopher *[MENA]* 8
Welcomes Knesset Approval of Accord *[MENA]* 9
Al-Jihad Members Held in Plot To Kill 'Arafat *[AL-SAFIR 20 Sep]* 9
Al-Baz Leaves for Libya With Mubarak Message *[Cairo Radio]* 9
Interior Minister To Announce Details of 'Plots' *[MENA]* 9

ARABIAN PENINSULA

Kuwait

'Source' Cited on Security Agreement With Russia *[London AL-SHARQ AL-AWSAT 18 Sep]* 10

Saudi Arabia

Crackdown on Opposition Feared After Alleged Attack *[London AL-QUDS AL-'ARABI 17 Sep]* .. 10

United Arab Emirates

President Sends Clinton Message on Peace, Ties *[Abu Dhabi Radio]* 10

IRAQ

Saddam Chairs RCC-Ba'th Party Meeting 23 Sep *[INA]* 11
'Text' of RCC Decree on Privatization *[AL-THAWRAH 21 Sep]* 11
SAIRI Claims Regime Executed Over 4,000 *[Kuwait Radio]* 12
Self-Incrimination Seen in Clinton Terror Remark *[AL-'IRAQ 17 Sep]* 12
Democratic Nature of 'Television of Youth' Lauded *[AL-THAWRAH 12 Sep]* 12
Trade Minister Receives Turkish Businessmen *[INA]* 13
Offers Oil for Lifting Embargo *[Voice of Iraqi People]* 13
Iraqi Confesses on TV to Being Iranian Spy *[AFP]* 13

ISRAEL

Knesset Concludes Debate, Votes To Support Accord 14
Review of 22 Sep Debate *[HA'ARETZ 23 Sep]* 14
Shamir Addresses Session *[Jerusalem Radio]* 15
Peres Concludes Debate *[Jerusalem Radio]* 16
MK's Vote 61-50 To Endorse Accord *[Jerusalem Radio]* 19
Rabin on Support for Government *[Jerusalem Radio]* 20
Rabin on Possibility of Elections *[Jerusalem TV]* 20
Peres Interviewed After Vote *[Jerusalem Radio]* 21
Peres on Next Steps in Talks *[Tel Aviv TV]* 21
Netanyahu: Likud Achieved Goal *[Jerusalem International TV]* 22
Rabinovich Denies Agreement Initialed With Syria *[Jerusalem Radio]* 22
Closure Imposed on Territories for Yom Kippur *[Jerusalem Radio]* 23
Plan for Mass Release of Palestinian Prisoners Denied *[Jerusalem Radio]* 23

JORDAN

Former Prime Minister Denies Cabinet Reshuffle *[AL-BILAD 22 Sep]* 24
EC Chairman Claes Arrives for Talks 23 Sep 24
Outlines Purpose of Visit *[Amman TV]* 24
Confers With al-Majali *[Amman Radio]* 24
Holds News Conference, Departs *[Amman Radio]* 24
Minister, Russia's Adamishin View Peace Process *[Amman Radio]* 25
Abu-Nuwar Denies 'Distorted' REUTER Report *[Amman TV]* 25

LEBANON

Hizballah Official on 'Massacre,' Peace Talks *[AL-'AHD 17 Sep]* 26
Buwayz, Delegation Leave for New York 23 Sep *[VOL]* 26

SYRIA

EC Chairman Claes Arrives in Damascus for Talks 27
Makes Arrival Statement *[Damascus Radio]* 27
Meets With al-Asad, al-Shar' *[Damascus Radio]* 27
Departs With 'Moderate Optimism' *[Damascus Radio]* 27
Khaddam, Dissident Fatah Leader Discuss Accord *[Paris Radio Monte Carlo]* 28
Iranian Request To Form 'Rejectionist Front' Denied *[London AL-SHARQ AL-AWSAT 21 Sep]* .. 28
U.S. Statement on Syrian Peace Commitment Reported *[Damascus Radio]* 28
Press on Country's 'Firm' Position on Peace *[Damascus Radio]* 28
Kuwaiti Fund To Finance Damascus Power Plant *[Damascus TV]* 29

SOUTH ASIA

Afghanistan

Rabbani Discusses Refugees With UN Commissioner *[Kabul Radio]* 30

India

Ministry Extends 'Full Support' to Yeltsin *[Delhi TV]* 30
Rao Rules Out Third-Party Mediation on Kashmir *[Delhi Radio]* 30
Article Assesses Rao's Visit to China *[THE HINDUSTAN TIMES 14 Sep]* 30
Border Accord Hailed *[THE HINDUSTAN TIMES 13 Sep]* 32
Commentary Lauds Outcome of Rao's Iran Visit *[Delhi International]* 33

Iran

PLO-Israel Accord Deemed 'Cosmetic' Change *[KAYHAN INTERNATIONAL, etc.]* 34
Arabic Beam Highlights Opposition to Accord *[Editorial Report]* 35

Jannati on 'Treachery' of Gaza-Jericho Accord *[Tehran Radio]* 36
Syria Unwilling To 'Concur With Every Compromise' *[Tehran Radio]* 37
GCC Asked To Show 'Prudence' in Ties With Tehran *[KAYHAN INTERNATIONAL 20 Sep]* 37
Room for Improved Ties With France Seen *[TEHRAN TIMES 15 Sep]* 38

Pakistan

Qureshi Stresses Nuclear Program 'Capped' *[THE MUSLIM 24 Sep]* 39
Iran's Borujerdi, Delegation Pay Official Visit 40
Entourage Arrives 23 Sep *[IRNA]* 40
Borujerdi Meets Qureshi, Sajjad *[Islamabad TV]* 41
More on Borujerdi, Sajjad Meeting *[IRNA]* 41
Editorial Views Iranian Stand on Kashmir *[NAWA-I-WAQT 23 Sep]* 41
U.S. Said Seeking Return of Stingers From Militants *[THE PAKISTAN OBSERVER 22 Sep]* 42

Palestinian Affairs

'Arafat Adviser on Post-Accord Plans, Issues

PM2309124593 London AL-HAYAH in Arabic 20 Sep 93 p 5

[Report on unattributed interview with Dr. Nabil Sha'th, political adviser to PLO Chairman Yasir 'Arafat in Cairo; date not given]

[Text] Dr. Nabil Sha'th, political adviser to Palestinian President Yasir 'Arafat, has confirmed that Palestinian-Israeli meetings will be held soon to discuss implementation of the autonomy agreement beginning with Gaza and Jericho. He revealed that PLO Executive Committee Member Mahmud 'Abbas (Abu-Mazin) and Israeli Foreign Minister Shim'on Peres, "at a bilateral meeting on the sidelines of the agreement signing ceremony in Washington, drew up plans of action for the future," but he ruled out a visit to Israel by Palestinian President Yasir 'Arafat before he visits Gaza, "then Jericho, then the rest of the homeland, and then Jerusalem to pray in al-Aqsa mosque."

In an interview with AL-HAYAH, he said that 'Arafat would visit New York within days to address the UN General Assembly. He expressed the hope that "the reservations of some people about the agreement would not affect the coordination meetings of the Arab cordon states."

He stressed that the PLO headquarters would remain in Tunis during the transitional period and that "the PLO will end with the establishment of an independent state, which will then be in charge of the Palestinian people's affairs at home and abroad." He expected that such a state would emerge in "less than two years." He also said that the Palestine National Council [PNC] "will convene in liberated Gaza for the first time since 1964."

In reply to a question, he said that "any historic agreement, even if it is a first step toward a final agreement, creates new political circumstances that some leading figures find they cannot come to terms with, and it becomes impossible for them to remain in the government, although they would still have the right to remain in the PNC or in opposition. Palestinian democracy must protect their right to oppose and express their views in any way that preserves national unity. Nobody can be part of the government while opposing its political line."

He added: "We respect those independent people and respect their right to express their views outside the Executive Committee. That attitude should continue after the formation of the transitional government, when political activity on the ground will be for the purpose of winning Palestinian and Arab hearts and minds in support of building the new Palestine on the way to the establishment of an independent state with holy Jerusalem as its capital."

On the date of the PNC meeting, he said that "the PLO went through a major crisis before the signing of the agreement because two years had passed since the Madrid conference without any achievements on the ground and because of the decline in PLO resources in that period. According to tradition, the agreement, having been signed in Washington, will be submitted to the Central Council (mini-parliament) and Israel will submit it to the Knesset. A government's approval of any agreement depends on the parliament's ratification. The PNC has given the Central Council full powers regarding the peace process."

He added that "a PNC session will be necessary when government organs in the liberated territories are to be formed. As the Israeli forces will withdraw fully from Gaza and Jericho within a period not exceeding five months, it will be possible for the PNC to convene in Gaza. That would be the first PNC meeting in liberated Palestinian territories since 1964. It should be noted that the PNC's structure will change because 160 members from the occupied territories who, in the past, could not attend for fear of deportation would be able to attend when the PNC meets in liberated Gaza."

On the question of holding official Palestinian-Israeli meetings in the course of normalization of relations, he said that "meetings will be held within the framework of the committees to be formed to discuss implementation of the agreement under the supervision of the peace conference cosponsors. A bilateral meeting was held between Mahmud 'Abbas (Abu-Mazin) and Shim'on Peres in Washington on the sidelines of the agreement signing ceremony. They drew up future plans of action. I believe that agreement on that will be reached during the 12th negotiation session in Washington next month."

Asked if 'Arafat would go to Israel in the near future if he received an official invitation, he replied that " 'Arafat will first go to liberated Gaza and Jericho before proceeding to meet with his people in the rest of the homeland and before going to holy Jerusalem to pray in al-Aqsa mosque."

On the reservations of some cordon states about the agreement, he said that "as far as the PLO is concerned there has been no change in the Palestinian commitment to a comprehensive solution. It is, therefore, expected that these meetings and the meetings of the heads of delegations in Washington will continue. The truth is that what has been achieved will boost the coordination if the PLO officially becomes the negotiating party just like the three governments of Syria, Lebanon, and Jordan. Furthermore, the Palestinian move to implement the interim solution takes the Palestinian-Israeli negotiations to the final phase and brings them up to the level of other Arab negotiations [with Israel], and that would promote effective coordination and help the Arab parties to proceed on their tracks toward a comprehensive solution."

On the U.S. contribution to the organization of elections in the autonomy areas and financial support for the setting up of autonomy institutions, Sha'th said that "so far there has been no announcement of specific U.S. aid and I do not expect major financial aid from the United States. I expect the major part to come from the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, the EC, and Japan."

In reply to another question, he said that "during his visit to the United States, 'Arafat insisted on visiting the United Nations and Dr. Butrus-Ghali in New York to underline the importance of the UN role and of international legitimacy. The United Nations has a role to play in the implementation of the agreement when Israel withdraws, inasmuch as the agreement provides for the presence of UN forces; in the future plans of action in support of Palestinian entity; and in fulfilling international legitimacy in the final negotiations.... 'Arafat will return to the United Nations. A date for his visit will be set in agreement with Dr. Butrus-Ghali."

He was asked: Will the PLO headquarters move to Gaza or Jericho, or will some institutions be moved to the interior [of the occupied territory] while others remain abroad? What is the PLO's future?

He replied that "this is something to be agreed upon when the transitional government institutions are set up. It should be noted that there are 90 Palestinian embassies abroad led from Tunis by the PLO. They represent the internationally recognized Palestinian foreign arm, which looks after Palestinian interests at home and abroad.

"That is why some organs will remain abroad during the transitional period, to ensure more PLO independence from the Israeli occupation authorities, which will still be present to protect the settlements in the West Bank but will have no presence at all in Gaza and Jericho.

"The PLO will come to an end and will be replaced by the Palestinian state with holy Jerusalem as its capital. The Palestinian state will then be in charge of protecting the people's interests at home and abroad, and it will then be responsible for all the Palestinian embassies abroad.

"Although theoretically the Palestinian state will emerge within a period not exceeding five years and the negotiations on that will be within two years, I, without exaggeration, expect the state to emerge within a much shorter time, and that is allowed under the Palestinian-Israeli agreement."

On the identity of those who will supervise the elections in Gaza and Jericho, he said that "there will be international supervision of the elections but basically they will be held under Palestinian police protection. Full withdrawal from the towns, villages, and camps in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip will have been completed before the elections. In other words, there will not be a single Israeli soldier there."

Asked when the Egyptian-Jordanian-Palestinian-Israeli joint quadripartite committee to fulfill the tasks assigned to it under the declaration of principles agreement will be formed, he said that "the committee will stem from the elected Palestinian government, in other words, after nine months, and its main responsibility will be the repatriation of the evacuees who were evicted after the 1967 aggression, and making the necessary arrangements for their repatriation. Half a million Palestinians are expected to return within two years. The measures here have nothing to do with the right to repatriation but are measures related to the priorities of repatriation."

'Abd-Rabbuh Comments on Knesset Vote on Accord

TA2309125793 Tel Aviv IDF Radio in Hebrew 1230 GMT 23 Sep 93

[Text] Reacting to the endorsement of the Israel-PLO agreement of principles by the Knesset, PLO spokesman Yasir 'Abd-Rabbuh told our Arab affairs correspondent Eldad Beck: It is a positive step. According to him, the PLO's Central Council will convene in another 10 days to ratify the agreement.

Referring to the majority attained in the Knesset vote—only 61 Knesset members—'Abd-Rabbuh said he is sure that the majority in the Israeli public supporting the agreement is larger than that attained in the Knesset.

'Abd-Rabbuh added that Yasir 'Arafat's call last night to cease the acts of violence referred to violence perpetrated by Palestinians against Israelis and vice versa.

'Abd-Rabbuh on Amman Talks, Gaza-Jericho Pact

JN2309125493 Amman Jordan Television Network in Arabic 1830 GMT 22 Sep 93

[Interview with Yasir 'Abd-Rabbuh, head of the PLO Information Department, by Muhammad al-Sharif in the studio; date not given—recorded]

[Text] [Al-Sharif] Dear viewers, God's blessings and peace be upon you. Arab and international attention still focuses on the Palestinian-Israeli agreement despite the fact that over a week has passed since the signing of that agreement in the U.S. capital, Washington. There are still many questions on the agreement. To answer some of these questions, we are pleased to have with us in this interview Yasir 'Abd-Rabbuh, head of the PLO Political Department. Welcome to the interview, Yasir.

['Abd-Rabbuh] Thank you.

[Al-Sharif] Yasir, you are in Amman to attend the Jordanian-Palestinian talks, which were co-chaired by His Majesty King Husayn and His Excellency President 'Arafat. Therefore, please allow me to start from the end, from these talks, before we return to the agreement and the questions and queries concerning that agreement. My direct question is: What happened during the Amman talks?

['Abd-Rabbuh] The talks in Amman over the past two days were different from previous talks. They focused on the practical matters which concern the negotiations during the forthcoming phase. They also discussed Jordanian-Palestinian coordination and ties at the beginning of the process to implement the Declaration of Principles or the so-called the interim period plan for the transitional Palestinian authority in the occupied Palestinian territories.

During these meetings, I think it was possible for us to discuss matters thoroughly and realistically, and to set up a number of committees and agencies to tackle the direct practical issues and seek to find solutions to them, on both the level of Palestinian-Jordanian bilateral ties, or on the level of the Jordanian and Palestinian stands during the negotiations with Israel during the forthcoming period so that these two stands would be completely united and proceed from the same common basis.

As we know, within the framework of the Palestinian-Israeli agreement, negotiations over the transitional phase and withdrawal from Gaza and Jericho should start within a period not exceeding 13 October. A number of practical issues will hinge on these negotiations and the subsequent withdrawal. These practical steps are of concern to Jordan and to us in the PLO. These were the kind of issues discussed. I can confirm that during the meeting between his majesty the king and President Yasir 'Arafat, there was a strong and sure desire to pool our efforts and put our full weight, as two parties, to ensure ceaseless work by the committees during the next few weeks to find practical solutions to several issues. There are, for instance, security issues and others with an economic, administrative, or legal nature. There are other issues, for which we ask full support from the brothers in Jordan. These include the training of the Palestinian police force which can enter [Gaza and Jericho] within a period not exceeding three months from now, and matters related to informational facilities regarding conditions on the ground, such as statistics and other data. The brothers on the fraternal Jordanian side have stressed that we will be provided by all of Jordan's resources in that regard to enable us to be fully prepared when the practical implementation of this agreement starts.

As you know, negotiations over withdrawal from Gaza and the West Bank must start after 13 October and end on 13 December. Israeli withdrawal must start as of 14 December until 13 April.

[Al-Sharif] Are you refering to the second phase of withdrawal, from the other parts of the West Bank?

['Abd-Rabbuh] No, I mean withdrawal from Gaza and Jericho, from 13 October to 13 April 1994. This is a relatively short span of time, and, as I have said, several practical arrangements must be made before that on all levels. We agreed with the brothers in Jordan to expedite the steps of coordination and joint action so that we will be fully prepared when the withdrawal starts?

[Al-Sharif] Excuse me, brother Yasir, let's stop here; I think this is an important point. The agreement clearly is between Israel and the PLO. This agreement brings new burdens to the PLO, burdens related to the authority. Is the PLO really prepared—by experience—to assume the responsibilities of real authority in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip?

['Abd-Rabbuh] First, the PLO has been working to prepare itself to assume this task. I cannot say this preparation is complete. It cannot be completed before this authority is really set up. But we should not ignore a basic factor, which is that many elements of this authority are effectively in place now. We will not be starting from scratch. There is the Palestinian educational complex in the West Bank and Gaza; the health complex and other apparatuses are there....

[Al-Sharif, interrupting] But they are intermingled with the Israelis.

['Abd-Rabbuh] There is a shell around these facilities represented by several Israelis in the Israeli Civil Administration. The Civil Administration will be dissolved. Military rule will end. So, none of the existing Palestinian facilities will be hurt. On the contrary, we will develop them so they serve the requirements and tasks of the next stage. Therefore, I say that we have the ground. We will work to offset any shortage. We are studying, that is, studies are currently being made, and we will conduct joint research with several brothers and specialists in the occupied territories to prepare the studies to offset shortages that may occur. We also cooperate with the brothers in Jordan in this field.

[Al-Sharif] Another comment: Naturally, the agreement does not mean Palestinian sovereignty on the West Bank and Gaza Strip during the transitional stage. This is clear and known. But, there are issues that provoke many questions. In particular, there is a hint in the agreement on direct taxes. Does this mean customs will not be the responsibility of the Palestinian authority, and does the lack of taxes and customs powers means more Israeli hegemony regarding this authority?

['Abd-Rabbuh] No sir, during the next stage, the next few months, some responsibilities and powers will be transferred, including direct taxes. But this does not mean these responsibilities and powers include everything that will be transferred. The agreement clearly says that after nine months elections will be held to elect a Palestinian council in the West Bank, Gaza, and Jerusalem. This council will be responsible for a number of main bodies, which will be something like ministries. They will include the fields of economic development, water, agricultural development, ports, and other vital sectors. This means the main facilities of the Palestinian economy will be in the hands of the Palestinian authority during the transition stage. There are other points, among which is that taxes should be indirect. The talk about direct taxes deals only with the stage before the elections and not the whole transitional stage.

[Al-Sharif] Mr. 'Abd-Rabbuh, talking about the elections, I am not sure if the agreement discusses this point in detail. How will these elections be held? On what basis will they be held? Who will take part in them? Who is not entitled to take part? Will they take place on a party or on an independent basis? What is the general framework of the elections?

['Abd-Rabbuh] Right now, I have no answers to some questions about the elections issue, because it has not been discussed. I can say, however, that with respect to the elections, all the residents, all the sons of the Palestinian people from the West Bank, Gaza, and Jerusalem, will take part in the elections. The 1967 refugees are also entitled to take part in the elections, even if they cannot return within nine months to exercise this right. A Palestinian council will be elected. It will have rights and legitimacy in the fields over which it will have jurisdiction. Of course, it will have executive powers. There will be an independent judicial apparatus. The Palestinian council will control and supervise all the land in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. This is the major issue of the agreement. In fact, we objected....

[Al-Sharif, interrupting] This means jurisdiction over the land?

['Abd-Rabbuh] Yes. We objected and continue to object to calling the agreement the Gaza-Jericho agreement. This is an absolutely incorrect rendering. I can even say that this is an attempt to water down the agreement. The agreement does not deal with Gaza and Jericho alone. The Gaza-Jericho issue is one article in the agreement. It deals with full withdrawal from Gaza and Jericho and an incomplete withdrawal from the rest of the territories. As for the Palestinian council, it will be responsible for all the lands of the West Bank and Gaza, with exceptions that do not negate this rule. These exceptions have been put off to the final stage, for discussions that start two years later. The council's jurisdiction over all West Bank and Gaza territories was a major point of controversy for 22 months during the Washington negotiations. During these negotiations, the Israelis used to say: We may discuss with you control over jobs or parts of the territory we give you. However, we insisted, whether during the Washington talks or through other back channels, that we will not give up the demand for the Palestinian council's territorial jurisdiction over all the territories.

[Al-Sharif] But there are exceptions, Mr. 'Abd-Rabbuh, concerning the settlements and Jerusalem, that occupy a large part of the West Bank?

['Abd-Rabbuh] Yes, exactly. These exceptions constitute 8 to 12 percent of the area. We do not measure Jerusalem by size. Jerusalem is our capital. Jerusalem is the heart of the Palestinian entity and the heart of the coming Palestinian state. Every part of our homeland is dear to us. We will not relinquish one iota of the soil of the homeland. The importance of this agreement is that it made Israel admit that Jerusalem is a topic on the agenda of the final status discussions two years from now. So are the settlements and the refugee issue. You know that the Israelis used to say that Jerusalem, the settlements, and the refugees were not subject to negotiations. They considered any discussion of the refugees issue a discussion of the right to repatriation. They claimed that the right to return was more dangerous than the establishment of a Palestinian state. These three topics are listed on the agenda of the final status negotiations. Therefore, there is a link between the interim and the final stages. The link exists not only in terms of time. It is not just a matter to be raised two years later. Rather, there is a linkage of topics. For the first time, the agenda of the final status is specified exactly. I will tell you something that is considered to be one of the secrets of the talks: The Israelis used to say: Let us put the question of sovereignty—in addition to Jerusalem, the settlements, and the refugees—as a point of discussion at the final status. We rejected that. This is because we considered sovereignty a matter that is not subject to negotiations. Sovereignty is one of the rights of the people who live on the land—the Palestinian people. What we agreed to discuss is the question of boundaries. Therefore, the boundaries issue is one of the final status topics. Definitely, the boundaries can only be drawn between two independent entities. Therefore, we said the sovereignty issue will not be negotiated. We said this is one of our nonnegotiable rights. We agreed only to discuss the boundaries between us. Hence the importance of the agreement.

Let me repeat that the agreement is not just about Gaza-Jericho. It is about withdrawal from the two areas, in the first place. We are talking about the Palestinian council taking over such areas as health, education, and other spheres four months after the withdrawal begins, or after completion of the withdrawal from Gaza and Jericho—supposedly by next July. The council will have gained complete authority when the elections are held in July 1994, as I pointed out.

[Al-Sharif] What will the government drawn from the elected council's membership look like? Do you have a picture of its configuration?

['Abd-Rabbuh] Most important, the council will enjoy the status of a legitimate body. It will be a legislature, or a parliament, if you like. For the interim period, an executive body will be formed from the council's membership. It will add up to a government that will execute the council's resolutions. It is an embryonic form; details need to be worked out later.

[Al-Sharif] What kind of relationship will the PLO, based across the border, have with the government?

['Abd-Rabbuh] The PLO will have a presence both inside and outside [of the West Bank and Gaza] until all aspects of the Palestinian people's problem are resolved, including the refugees displaced in 1948. The PLO represents all the Palestinian people. The significance of what happened in Washington is not so much the signing of the declaration of principles as recognizing the Palestinian people's identity, their sole representative, and the refugees as such. The PLO will still be around, and it will

speak for the Palestinians in the diaspora. The council that will be elected will be part of the Palestine National Council [PNC]. You know that Palestinians inside [the occupied territories] had a quota in the PNC—186 members. Due to the circumstances of occupation and related impediments, it was not possible for our brothers inside the homeland to take part in the proceedings of the PNC. Now, once the elections are held, the elected members will join the PNC. They will discharge their responsibilities within the framework of the Palestinian authority, and the PNC and the executive bodies will become the points of reference for the Palestinian people and the elected authority. Given the Palestinian people's unique circumstances, these are all transitional arrangements that will remain in place until such time as the Palestinian issue is resolved, within five years, as we hope, God willing.

[Al-Sharif] The agreement does not provide for the elected Palestinian authority to control foreign affairs. Is the PLO taking a circuitous route around the agreement?

['Abd-Rabbuh] Certainly not. This authority lacks the status of an independent state during the interim period. Logically, then, the foreign affairs of the Palestinian people—and don't forget that one half of them are outside their land and, therefore, outside the brief of this authority—will be handled by the PLO. It is natural that this is so.

[Al-Sharif] During the negotiations in Washington and Oslo with the Israelis, the Palestinians reportedly insisted that the outlines of the final settlement be well defined, especially regarding Jerusalem, the borders, settlements, and the refugees. Do you have a clear picture of these outlines?

['Abd-Rabbuh] Let me be absolutely clear. The agreement stipulates that the boundaries issue will be addressed in the final stage. A final solution envisages an independent state.

The second thing is that when the question of the settlements, as well as other questions, are raised, they know our position very well. There is absolutely no room for settlements on Palestinian territory. Anyone who wants to live on this Palestinian territory must fully abide by its laws, within the context of Palestinian sovereignty.

As for Jerusalem, we will not accept any formula that could put Jerusalem up for bargaining. They know this. This is not only a Palestinian position, but an Arab, Islamic, and Christian attitude. This was clear a few days ago at the meeting of the Arab League, during our meetings with many Arab delegations. No Arab country will agree to establish peaceful relations in the region without settling the question of Jerusalem.

We believe, therefore, that regarding these questions, the other party knows in advance that moving toward normal, peaceful relations in the region is linked to settling these basic issues. The Arab meeting in Cairo affirmed this. This is the common denominator of the Arab position, the Islamic position, and the Christian position in general. When I talk about the position of the Arab and Islamic states, however, this is the common denominator.

[Al-Sharif] Let us move on to fears addressed by many analysts. There is, as a matter of fact, a major fear of internal Palestinian fighting and clashes. There has been a peaceful dispute so far, but there are fears that it might develop into an armed clash.

['Abd-Rabbuh] I want to say this explicitly: Let everyone rest assured that there will be nothing more than a legitimate, democratic, political dispute between Palestinians. This question is a red line for all Palestinians. We face occupation together. It is legitimate for us to have differences. The majority of the Palestinian masses took to the streets last week not only to support the agreement but also to say we can overcome our differences by democratic means.

I think the fulminations of this or that person cannot be taken at all seriously. Our eyes should look in a different direction to prevent any attempts to obstruct the establishment of this Palestinian authority on Palestinian territory, or any slackening in implementing the agreement or tampering with the timetable of this agreement. I am afraid that this issue—or fears as they are called—might be used as a pretext by the other party to try to evade implementing the agreement or to try to obstruct it. So, regarding this question, I believe the awareness of the Palestinian people and the degree of cohesion they showed last week—the great demonstrations of hundreds of thousands to reaffirm their support for the PLO, raising the Palestinian flag on every house and place and car and at the door of every camp, village, and neighborhood—this was an expression of the true Palestinian referendum. This is the attitude of the vast majority of the Palestinian people. The Palestinian people absolutely will not accept any disagreement developing into something more than dialogue and democratic dispute. I read about these fears in Washington a week ago and I was asked about Palestinian differences and splits. I told them that when these differences exist in Israel, you call them democratic, but when we have differences, you call them splits. We adhere to our democratic traditions and we will defend the right of the opposition, any opposition, to present its views.

When people talk about the role of the Palestinian police, well, the Palestinian police are not there to interfere in dialogue or any differences. On the contrary, their job is to protect the right of free expression for every citizen and every Palestinian party. We think that the task of the Palestinian police is to protect society's security and political security, meaning the right of everybody to express their views by democratic means and having a majority and minority, also by peaceful means.

[Al-Sharif] Within this framework there is talk about the intifadah. The mutual recognition document between Israel and the PLO contains a Palestinian pledge to stop violence....

['Abd-Rabbuh, interrupting] Not at all.

[Al-Sharif] They interpreted this as an end to the intifadah.

['Abd-Rabbuh] Let them interpret as they wish. They, the others, and the whole world know the intifadah is a broad popular movement launched as a result of occupation. This movement was not launched by anyone's decision. It will not stop because of anyone's decision, or after a word here or a word there that anybody can interpret as he wishes. The intifadah is a popular movement that began as a result of occupation. It will end when the occupation is over, when the youths of Jabaliyah, Janin, or Nabulus do not see an occupation presence to attack with stones. When the army is out of their sight, intifadah activities will stop.

[Al-Sharif] Mr. Yasir, you made a statement on the return of evacuees [of 1967]. After the agreement was declared, you said that there is an agreement on the return of 700,000 Palestinian evacuees from abroad. In fact, the agreement does not fix the number of these evacuees. Has there really been an agreement on a definite number?

['Abd-Rabbuh] No, the agreement is not on a definite number, but on the principle of the return of 1967 evacuees. Our estimates, based on initial statistics, indicate they number 800,000 or a little more. Anyway, this is a statistical subject that will be audited. But the right is there. The agreement includes an item saying a committee of Jordan, Egypt, Israel, and the PLO will only discuss arrangements for the return, not the principle of return. Why? Because the majority of evacuees, almost all the evacuees of 1967, went to Jordan or Egypt—of course, a smaller number went to Egypt than to Jordan—the arrangements deal with practical and economic aspects, ways of absorbing returnees and the timetable for this process. As I said, our estimate is 800,000, but the final number depends on examining the statistics. By the way, yesterday we discussed this subject with the brothers in the Government of Jordan. Luckily, thanks to the accuracy and efficiency of Jordanian Government establishments, there are almost full statistics of the number of evacuees and others, which will benefit us....

[Al-Sharif] Can we get the number, approximately?

['Abd-Rabbuh] I said these statistics are there, but I do not have them now.

[Al-Sharif] There are people who hold titles as evacuees [of 1967] and refugees [of 1948]. Are they included in the final or the current solution?

['Abd-Rabbuh] Someone who left the West Bank in 1967, even if he had been a refugee since 1948, will be treated as an evacuee in 1967, of course.

[Al-Sharif] You mean this issue has been resolved?

['Abd-Rabbuh] Yes.

[Al-Sharif] We have many questions, but due to the limited time of this program, I want to conclude it with the future concept of Jordanian-Palestinian relations.

['Abd-Rabbuh] This subject, as we know, was discussed in depth at every meeting. The talks at the last meeting between his majesty the king and brother President Yasir 'Arafat, and the talks we held last night and the night before, were based on an important fundamental, which is that we should discuss practical intermingled issues to bolster coordination and joint action in the economic, administrative, organizational, legal, environmental, and joint security fields. Whenever we can reach agreement and find common ground on these issues, this edifice will gradually grow.

The aim is to establish distinguished relations. The final form of these relations will be decided by the two peoples when the occupation has been removed from Palestinian territory, so the two peoples, voluntarily and of their own free will, decide on the appropriate form.

As you know, there is a Palestine National Council [PNC] resolution about the form of the relationship. This resolution has been reiterated. However, we do not regard anything as final and finalized. As I said, this issue requires work that should begin now. It requires ties that should be strengthened. When the occupation ends, the two peoples will be able to have their say. There are special and distinguished ties, however, that cannot be broken between the Jordanian and Palestinian twins.

[Al-Sharif] At the end of this program, would you like to address a special message to the brothers in the occupied territory?

['Abd-Rabbuh] I would like to assert that the unity that was manifested in the occupied territory—the Palestinian people's unity from Rafah until Tubas—in support of the PLO and independent Palestinian national decisionmaking and in support of the PLO's achievement, is our primary weapon in the very hard and stiff battles that we will fight during the implementation of each point in the agreement.

I say frankly that the road is not easy. We should not imagine that the moment the agreement was signed the road toward all our aims became passable. There are many snags and difficulties. Our determination, the determination and unity of our prisoners in the occupied territory, the determination of Palestinian women and youth, the determination of all the Palestinian people in the countryside, in towns and villages, and in the refugee camps to adhere to this great nationalist goal, to this unity, and to deal with any differences and contradictions in spirit of unity and democracy, this determination will enable us to shorten the phase facing us and reach our state, our holy Jerusalem, our national aims, and unity with the other twin, fraternal Jordan.

[Al-Sharif] Thank you, sir.

['Abd-Rabbuh] Thank you.

PLO Envoy Denies Closure of Baghdad Offices

PM2309141593 London AL-SHARQ AL-AWSAT in Arabic 21 Sep 93 p 5

[Unattributed report: "Despite Official Denial by Palestinian Ambassador to Iraq, Baghdad Calls for Change in Palestinian Leadership; Sources Talk About Closure of PLO Headquarters"]

[Excerpt] Amman, AL-SHARQ AL-AWSAT; London, Political Studies Center; Baghdad, news agencies—Authoritative Palestinian sources said in Amman yesterday that differences between the PLO and the Iraqi Government have become so severe that most of the PLO's offices in Baghdad have been closed. Palestinian Ambassador in Baghdad 'Azzam al-Ahmad said in a statement to AL-SHARQ AL-AWSAT yesterday that there are no differences between the two sides and no PLO offices have been closed. There have been conflicting reports about Iraq's position on the Palestinian-Israeli agreement. While the Palestinian ambassador stresses that Iraq supports the agreement, the sources say that the PLO sent [PLO Political Department Head] Faruq Qaddumi to Baghdad to settle the problem with Baghdad and explain the agreement to it. The Iraqi newspaper AL-THAWRAH yesterday attacked the agreement and called for a decisive and principled position against it. It also called for a change in the Palestinian leadership.

In Amman authoritative Palestinian sources revealed to AL-SHARQ AL-AWSAT that the Palestinian-Iraqi differences erupted over a year ago following the Iraqi Government's objection to the strong relations the Palestinian leadership maintains with the Egyptian Government.

The sources said that the PLO's recognition of Israel and then its signing of a peace agreement exploded relations between the Palestinian and Iraqi sides—which prompted the Iraqi Government last week to issue a decision to close all offices belonging to the PLO in Iraq and to expel its military cadres present in Iraq—over 5,000 of them. These forces will leave Iraqi territory early next month.

The sources said that in the wake of the deterioration of relations between Iraq and the PLO and following the signing of the Palestinian-Israeli agreement, the PLO sent the head of the Political Department to Baghdad with a view to easing the severity of the Iraqi position opposed to the Palestinian-Israeli agreement. The sources pointed out that Qaddumi partially succeeded in easing the Iraqi reaction to the signing of the agreement and in delaying for several months the Iraqi decision to close PLO offices in Iraq until PLO offices in several Arab capitals—including Tunis, Amman, Cairo, and Baghdad—are moved to Gaza and Jericho. As for the Palestinian military forces in Iraq, they will be moved to Jordan in preparation for moving them to Gaza and Jericho among the Palestinian police forces which will take charge of maintaining security and order during the Palestinians' self-rule. This is in the knowledge that these decisions do not include the offices belonging to the Palestinian rejectionist fronts like the Democratic Front [for the Liberation of Palestine], the Popular Front [for the Liberation of Palestine], and the Arab Liberation Front.

Meanwhile, the Palestinian ambassador to Baghdad has described as untrue reports that the Iraqi authorities have closed Palestinian offices in Iraq. He said that "the Palestinian situation in Iraq is still the same; nothing new has occurred." He pointed out that Iraqi officials understood the Palestinian view conveyed to them by Qaddumi, that they stressed the necessity not to harm Palestinian national unity, and that they are against the establishment of any organization to replace the PLO. [passage omitted]

PRC Reportage on 'Arafat Visit

W'A2309150493

For PRC reportage on the visit by Yasir 'Arafat, PLO chairman, including reports on his talks with President Jiang Zemin and Premier Li Peng, please see the Near East & South Asia section of the 21 September China DAILY REPORT and subsequent issues.

Algeria

Ali Kafi Addresses Council of Ministers on Tasks

LD2209211193 Algiers ENTV Television Network in Arabic 1900 GMT 22 Sep 93

[Excerpts] The Council of Ministers convened today under the chairmanship of Ali Kafi, chairman of the Higher State Council [HSC], and endorsed two bills submitted by the minister of economy. The first bill was of a legislative nature concerning the promotion of investments and the other concerned the formation of a national economic and social council. [passage omitted]

Ali Kafi made an instructive statement, which included the following:

[Begin Kafi recording] The government's work must fall within the framework of the concept of the continuity of the state, and in a way that facilitates the finding of real and lasting solutions to the problems experienced in our country. The governmental change also comes within the scope of the continuity of the HSC's strategy and in the framework of the abandonment of incorrect methods and practices in behavior and action. The continuity and the abandonment must be manifested in priority areas which must be undertaken by the government.

The appointment of a member of the HSC as the head of government aims at bringing about harmony in the action strategy at the levels of the HSC and the government, and at avoiding duplication in the work of public authorities. This unity of action should facilitate stronger and more substantial activity by the state and the administration so that it will be more effective and encompass the national territory.

Only an effective presence of the administration in society will reinstate trust between the authority and the people, particularly by appropriately understanding the citizens problems and gradually mobilizing them toward real objectives. Naturally, resolving our citizens' problems is closely linked to a comprehensive solution to the economic question. In this context, the government has to be aware of the scale of the current stakes and the challenges we have to face. We have to adopt, in an objective, lucid and pragmatic way, an economic strategy that will provide the opportunity for our country to safeguard the ingredients it possesses for success in the new world economic system.

The gradual and organized shift to a market economy that we have begun cannot and will not be at the expense of the poor. The government will have to put in place the mechanisms necessary not only for maintaining purchasing power but also, and especially, for safeguarding the citizen's dignity. [passage omitted] [end recording]

Egypt

Musa Details Official Talks With Christopher

NC2309185293 Cairo MENA in Arabic 1716 GMT 23 Sep 93

[Text] Washington, 23 Sep (MENA)—Foreign Minister 'Amr Musa said that his talks with U.S. Secretary of State Warren Christopher today focused on the completion of the Middle East peace process and the need for swift movement on the Syrian and Lebanese tracks.

He told a MENA correspondent in Washington after an hour of talks with the U.S. secretary that Egypt realized the importance of such moves to face the new reality in the region after recent developments, which may lead to an Arab-Israeli peace, and international developments represented by the end of the Cold War era.

Musa noted President Mubarak's intensive efforts and the fact that in only five days he met with Palestinian President Yasir 'Arafat, Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhaq Rabin, and Syrian President Hafiz al-Asad.

He said the president also held several telephone conversations with U.S. President Bill Clinton during the same period.

The foreign minister said that after the signing of the PLO-Israeli agreement last week all those involved in the peace process, especially Egypt, have two tasks: to help implement the Palestinian-Israeli agreement and to push forward the Syrian and Lebanese tracks of the peace process.

Musa expressed confidence that progress will be made on the Syrian and Lebanese tracks simply because there must be a comprehensive settlement for peace to be achieved. There can be no real peace without a full settlement of the conflict in the region, he said.

The foreign minister said that in parallel with the peace process a serious discussion to reconsider "the Arab security concept" is now under way. He said Egypt asked the Arab League to offer a new proposal on the concept of Arab security; that is, formulating regional ties within the framework of the new relations, the expected peace with Israel, and international circumstances.

Past and current developments, Musa said, require a new future outlook toward the situation in the region, including Arab-Arab relations, to face the stage of upcoming transformations. He said the future stage will be completely different from the past stage, which was marked by 40 years of conflict during the Cold War.

The foreign minister stressed the importance of the conference that will be held in Washington on 1 October to discuss the necessary allocations to support the peace agreement. He said that without improving economic conditions, it will be difficult to convince the people that peace is worthwhile. He said the implementation of the Palestinian-Israeli agreement cannot be confined to security and land.

Musa said his talks in Washington also dealt with the future of U.S. aid to Egypt. He said the Congress' Foreign Appropriations Committee is strongly inclined not to touch the aid to Egypt.

Concluding his statements, the foreign minister said his talks with U.S. Secretary of State Warren Christopher today dealt with a number of regional and international issues, notably African affairs, which involves Egypt because of its chairmanship of the OAU. The discussions also dealt with the situation in Somalia and the Horn of Africa, and the developments in Bosnia and the Mediterranean.

Welcomes Knesset Approval of Accord

NC2409070993 Cairo MENA in Arabic 0602 GMT 24 Sep 93

[Text] Washington, 24 Sep (MENA)—Foreign Minister 'Amr Musa has welcomed the Israeli Knesset's ratification of the recent Israel-PLO agreement over a declaration of principles for the autonomy period. He stressed, however, that the most important thing is implementing the agreement, which must be carried out promptly and with the utmost earnestness.

The foreign minister remarked that the Knesset's approval is "an important step" because it demonstrates the Israeli people's backing for peace.

Musa added: The Knesset's approval should not prevent us from saying that the path is still long and we must expect to face numerous difficulties and obstacles in implementing the agreement. Nevertheless, a new spirit of peace now prevails in the region.

'Amr Musa is expected to conclude his four-day Washington visit today. Before his departure, he will meet with U.S. Defense Secretary Les Aspin, Vice President Al Gore, and Anthony Lake, assistant to the U.S. President for national security affairs.

This evening Musa will leave for New York where he is due to deliver Egypt's address to the UN General Assembly session next Monday. He will also meet with the foreign ministers and other officials of various countries attending the opening of the new session.

Musa is due to return to Washington next Friday to chair Egypt's delegation to the first meeting of the Conference to Support Middle East Peace. The meeting will discuss financial appropriations to support the new Palestinian authority in the territories from which Israel will withdraw in line with the Palestinian-Israeli agreement.

Al-Jihad Members Held in Plot To Kill 'Arafat

NC2309151893 Beirut AL-SAFIR in Arabic 20 Sep 93 p 13

[Text] Egyptian security sources have revealed that the State Security Detective Agency discovered a plot to assassinate PLO Chairman Yasir 'Arafat in a booby-trapped car at the entrance to the Arab League building.

AL-SAFIR learned that the security authorities arrested four men belonging to the al-Jihad Organization at dawn yesterday in connection with the assassination plot.

The source, a security official tasked with guarding the Arab League building, did not confirm or deny the plot. But he said the security authorities arrested 41 al-Jihad Organization members, including those arrested at dawn yesterday, hours before the Arab foreign ministers meeting.

The source said contacts took place in the past few days between the leaders of Hamas [Islamic Resistance Movement] in Jordan and al-Jihad Organization members in Cairo.

Al-Baz Leaves for Libya With Mubarak Message

NC2309121293 Cairo Arab Republic of Egypt Radio Network in Arabic 1130 GMT 23 Sep 93

[Text] Dr. Usamah al-Baz, first Foreign Ministry under secretary and director of the President's Office for Political Affairs, left Cairo today on his way to Libya on a visit, during which he will deliver a message to brother Colonel Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi, leader of the Libyan revolution, from President Husni Mubarak. The message deals with Arab developments and Egypt's efforts to prevent an escalation of the situation with regard to the Libyan-Western crisis, particularly as the deadline of the three Western states to intensify the sanctions against Libya ends on 1 October.

Interior Minister To Announce Details of 'Plots'

NC2309150993 Cairo MENA in Arabic 1417 GMT 23 Sep 93

[Text] Cairo, 23 Sep (MENA)—Interior Minister Hasan al-Alfi has stated that the police realize the dimensions of the current security situation and its immense challenges. The police have laid their fingers on the threads of the plots concocted at home and abroad and the sources that finance the criminal groups. He added that he will announce the details and dimensions of these plots soon.

Al-Alfi made this statement during a plenary meeting he held today with the assistant interior ministers, the security directors in the governorates, and the heads of the Ministry's departments.

Al-Alfi said he has issued instructions to form a committee to evaluate the security situation and to improve and develop police work.

Kuwait

'Source' Cited on Security Agreement With Russia

PM2309111593 London AL-SHARQ AL-AWSAT in Arabic 18 Sep 93 p 4

[Unattributed report: "Kuwaiti Defense Minister To Visit Moscow Wednesday To Sign Security Agreement with Russia"]

[Excerpt] Kuwait, AL-SHARQ AL-AWSAT—A Kuwaiti military source yesterday confirmed to AL-SHARQ AL-AWSAT that the Kuwaiti Defense Ministry was interested in concluding a defense agreement with Russia to strengthen Kuwait's security strategy. He said that the security agreement with Russia would be signed by the end of this current week and that Defense Minister Shaykh 'Ali al-Sabah would leave for Moscow Wednesday.

The source pointed out that, in addition to concluding security agreements with some major states, the Kuwaiti Defense Ministry is currently following a well thought-out plan to boost Kuwait's intrinsic military power through continuous training and by supplying the Kuwaiti Army with the most modern arms and military technology.

He also said that, over the past period, the Kuwaiti Armed Forces carried out a number of land, sea, and air military exercises with U.S., British, and French forces in the context of a specific and well conceived program in implementation of the security agreements concluded with these states, whose position during the battle for the liberation of Kuwait from Iraqi occupation was honorable.

Kuwait has also been rebuilding its military establishment by rearming the Kuwaiti Army and concluding arms deals to reinforce the country's defensive capabilities and has opened the door for voluntary as well as compulsory conscription for Kuwaitis. The Defense Ministry has also moved to reshuffle the military establishment and restructure the Kuwaiti Army. It has stopped admitting stateless persons to the military and is concentrating on the Kuwaiti element in that respect.

As far as Kuwait's border security is concerned, the Kuwaiti Defense Ministry has played a major part in securing Kuwait's northern border with Iraq. The Defense Ministry has reinforced its forces on the northern border. The "Fence Brigade" has the responsibility of defending Kuwaiti borders against Iraqi threats. Furthermore, Kuwait is on the verge of completing the border trench it started after the final UN decision on the demarcation of the Iraqi-Kuwaiti border. [passage omitted]

Saudi Arabia

Crackdown on Opposition Feared After Alleged Attack

PM2309110793 London AL-QUDS AL-'ARABI in Arabic 17 Sep 93 p 1

[Unattributed report: "Mysterious Saudi Royal Court Storming Incident Provokes Oppositionists' Fears About a New Arrest Campaign"]

[Excerpts] London, AL-QUDS AL-'ARABI—In a private meeting involving a small group of Arab intellectuals in London, a senior Saudi official was quoted as saying that "the Saudi salafi [Islamic reformist] opposition remains tolerable as long as it continues its present peaceful course limited to petitions, mosque sermons, and cassettes. But the danger is that it will resort to arms—a red line which the government cannot allow to be crossed."

Two weeks after this meeting many observers woke to a statement carried by the SAUDI NEWS AGENCY quoting a senior security source who revealed that a gunman had tried to storm the Saudi Royal Court in which King Fahd Bin-'Abd-al-'Aziz is usually present. He fired shots toward the entrance, seriously wounding one of the guards. A civilian was slightly wounded.

Although the statement promised to provide further details about the mysterious incidents, the government did not announce any other details about the person involved, his identity, and his political affiliations. Nor did it reveal whether or not the Saudi monarch was inside the palace when the incident took place. [passage omitted]

The question which remains unanswered—until the identity of the person involved, who was described as "abnormal" in his behavior, has been revealed—is about the salafis' link with the incident, whether or not they were behind it, and is this a shift from civilian opposition to military opposition.

A Saudi source close to the salafi opposition suspects the official story and expresses fears that the incident could be a prelude to launching a new arrest campaign. The source said that the salafis still insist on using traditional opposition methods in offering advice to the rulers through written petitions. And that so far there is no intention of taking up arms, because if that happens, it would mean the hope for reform has been lost and that any dialogue is futile, and this has not happened so far.

It is worth noting that the salafis, who are using the al-Qasim area on the Najd hills as the base for their opposition, demanded major reforms in the state's foreign and domestic policies and criticized the use of Western forces in the Gulf war. They also demanded that corruption be fought, the media reformed, usurious banks banned, and the Islamic Shari'ah applied more strictly. [passage omitted]

United Arab Emirates

President Sends Clinton Message on Peace, Ties

JN2409104593 Abu Dhabi United Arab Emirates Radio Network in Arabic 0930 GMT 24 Sep 93

[Text] His Highness Shaykh Zayid Bin-Sultan Al Nuhayyan, the president, has sent a written message to His Excellency U.S. President Bill Clinton. The message deals with the situation in the region, the developments in the Middle East peace process, and bilateral relations of cooperation and friendship.

Saddam Chairs RCC-Ba'th Party Meeting 23 Sep

JN2309183893 Baghdad INA in Arabic 1829 GMT 23 Sep 93

[Text] Baghdad, 23 Sep (INA)—President Saddam Husayn has chaired a joint meeting of the Revolution Command Council and the Iraq Command of the Arab Socialist Ba'th Party.

'Text' of RCC Decree on Privatization

JN2309122393 Baghdad AL-THAWRAH in Arabic 21 Sep 93 p 4

["Text" of Iraqi Revolution Command Council decree authorizing the minister of industry and minerals to turn his ministry's factories into public joint-stock companies]

[Text] In the name of God, the merciful, the compassionate.
The Republic of Iraq
The Revolution Command Council [RCC]
Decree No. 140
Date of decree: 27 Rabi' Awwal, 1414 Hegira, corresponding to 13
September 1993

Decree

Based on the provisions of Paragraph A of Article 42 of the Constitution, the RCC decrees the following:

I. The minister of industry and minerals shall be authorized to turn the factories affiliated to the ministry into public joint-stock companies after obtaining the approval of the Presidential Office in accordance with the following:

A. The company's assets shall consist of the buildings; machines; equipment, including the land on which the factory installations are erected; the means of transportation; stocks; and furniture belonging to the factory intended to be turned into a company. The value of these assets shall be estimated in accordance with the criteria adopted by the Ministry of Industry and Minerals.

B. The company's capital shall consist of one Iraqi dinar par value shares. The ministry shall hold through the state enterprise to which the factory was affiliated no less than 25 percent of the shares. The remaining shares, which will not exceed 75 percent of the company's shares, shall be sold in public auction to the Iraqis as individuals or corporate bodies. They shall be sold at the Baghdad stock market in accordance with Law No. 32 of 1986 on selling and leasing state funds as an exception to Baghdad stock market Law No. 24 of 1991 and in accordance with instructions issued by the minister of industry and minerals in coordination with the stock market management.

C. 1. The proceeds of the sold shares shall go to the Finance Ministry.

2. The Finance Ministry shall lend the company an operational capital of not less than 5 million dinars free of interest, provided that it is repaid within a maximum period of one unextendible year.

D. The Ministry of Industry and Minerals shall prepare the company's articles of partnership and present them to the registrar of companies, who will register the company, issue an incorporation certificate, and publish it in the official gazette and one local newspaper. The articles of partnership shall include the following data:

1. The name of the company with the phrase "public joint-stock company" following it.

2. The aims of the company.

3. The activity of the company.

4. The capital of the company broken down into shares.

5. The company shall be a corporate body enjoying financial and administrative independence as of the date of the issuance of its incorporation certificate.

6. Following the issuance of the incorporation certificate, the minister of industry and minerals shall fix the date the company can commence its work provided that the period between the issuance of the certificate and the start of work does not exceed 60 days.

7. The company shall be linked to the Ministry of Industry and Minerals and shall operate according to the laws, regulations, and rules of service and instructions observed at the ministry. The ministry shall extend the required aid to the company in the same manner as aid is extended to the establishments affiliated to it.

8. The State Directorate for Industrial Development shall give the company an incorporation license for its industrial project according to the Industrial Investment Law No. 25 for 1991 on the private and mixed sectors. The industrial project shall be exempted from all taxes and fees stipulated in the above law and for a period of 10 years beginning from the date the incorporation license is issued.

9. Net profit shall be distributed as follows after all appropriations and deductions have been made:

A. An obligatory reserve of at least 5 percent and up to 25 percent of capital. Upon a decision by the general assembly, it is permissible to continue deductions but without exceeding 100 percent of the paid-up capital. The above-mentioned reserve shall be expended according to the provisions of Article 74 of the Companies Law No. 36 of 1983.

B. The remaining profit or part of it shall be allotted to the shareholders according to their contributions upon a decision by the general assembly.

10. A. The company shall be chaired by an commissioned manager appointed by the minister of industry and minerals.

B. The duties, powers, salaries, and rewards of the commissioned manager shall be determined by the board of directors.

11. The company accounts shall be subject to the scrutiny and auditing of the Fiscal Control Department.

12. The provisions of Companies Law No. 36 for 1983 on mixed joint-stock companies shall apply to the company on matters not stated in this decree, including the provisions related to the general assembly and the board of directors.

II. Any text conflicting with the provisions of this decree shall be inapplicable.

III. The minister of industry and minerals shall issue instructions to facilitate the implementation of the provisions of this decree.

IV. This decree shall become effective as of the date of its issuance in the official gazette. The competent ministers and concerned quarters shall implement it.

[Signed] Saddam Husayn, chairman of the Revolution Command Council

SAIRI Claims Regime Executed Over 4,000

LD2409092293 Kuwait Radio Kuwait in Arabic 2100 GMT 23 Sep 93

[Text] The opposition Supreme Assembly of the Islamic Revolution in Iraq [SAIRI] has announced that the Iraqi regime has executed thousands of people to suppress a popular uprising at the end of August. SAIRI's statement said that over 4,000 prisoners and detainees, mostly from southern and central Iraq, were executed in the aftermath of the uprising. The statement added that signs of torture were visible on the bodies of the victims which were returned to their families.

The statement, released in Vienna, pointed out that in the last few days the city of Baghdad and southern and central Iraqi governorates have witnessed wide-scale campaigns of arrest carried out by Iraqi security forces. It added that there was great tension and disturbance in the security situation, and that the Iraqi regime's forces have been patrolling streets and popular districts and arresting Iraqis at random.

Self-Incrimination Seen in Clinton Terror Remark

JN2309184193 Baghdad AL-'IRAQ in Arabic 17 Sep 93 p 8

[Article by 'Abd-al-Qadir Salman 'Alwan: "Self-Incriminating Words"]

[Text] Immediately following the Gaza-Jericho accord signing ceremony on the White House lawn, Bill Clinton the waffler gave a television interview. I was especially struck by the U.S. President's answer to one of the questions. Question: Is there a difference between terrorism and the fight for freedom, since one man's terrorist may be another man's freedom fighter? Answer: I think you might say this is a case of the beauty being in the eyes of the beholder. However, from the standpoint of the United States, terrorism is the premeditated murder of civilians unconnected with military actions.

So that's how Bill Clinton and the U.S. Administration would define terror.

I'd just like to put the following questions to the U.S. President:

—Does your definition apply to the murder of over 400 men, women, and children at the al-'Amiriyah shelter in Baghdad?

—Does you definition apply to the murder of Layla al-'Attar, a female Iraqi painter, in her sleep?

—Does your definition apply to the massacre of Somalis who had their houses brought down on their heads by your helicopter gunships?

—Does your definition apply to the murder of the children of the stones by Zionist gunfire?

—And, how would you explain your atrocities in Vietnam, Panama, and Grenada?

I wish you had the answers. Would you respond by saying that Layla al-'Attar had warlike connections, women and children were engaged in Somali resistance, the al-'Amiriyah shelter was recognized by your superlative military intelligence and spy agencies as a legitimate Iraqi military target?

Thanks, Mr. President, for having incriminated youself.

Democratic Nature of 'Television of Youth' Lauded

JN1709202693 Baghdad AL-THAWRAH in Arabic 12 Sep 93 p 8

[Article by Husayn al-Shahrabli: "A Program We Have Been Waiting For"]

[Excerpts] Praise for the sake of praise is servile flattery and hypocrisy.

But what about a course of action that restores hope to those who lost it, and fulfills the dreams of those who stopped dreaming a long time ago? What about a course that will be a haven for those unjustly treated by officials who only care for themselves, a course that is a positive reaction to many cases of despondency, and a course that shakes the dust from the files of those who had been unjustly treated?

Such a course deserves praise and admiration, because it genuinely embodies the democracy that Saddam Husayn seeks, a democracy that governs the relationship between the citizen and his brother citizen, between the official and the citizen, and between the citizen and his own conscience, and the official and his conscience.

Because 'Udayy in his relations with citizens adopts the style of the son who emulates his father, a style based on facts and love for Iraqis, he has greatly assisted the president leader in establishing a sound and healthy democratic atmosphere, an atmosphere embodied in these windows through which the citizen smells the fresh air, vents his anguish, submits his complaints, and exposes the

corruption of those who exploit their position to harass, exhaust the people, lie to and unjustly treat them.

In my name and on behalf of many citizens who are witnessing how democracy is being exercised on the ground through the Television of Youth, I would like to praise one of these windows, the program that airs their complaints and worries and shows how their legitimate requests have been ignored, thus making them ask questions and feel cheated. [passage omitted]

Let the citizen speak, without fear, and without cowing his spirit. This was the title of the program which appeared on the screen.

What is important is that a democratic window through which the citizens air their concerns—in a simple and uncomplicated language understood by all, whether by the minister or the man in the street, away from generalization—has achieved two objectives:

The first is that citizens' problems are being solved, as confirmed by the quick tackling of these problems.

The second is the prevalence of objective criticism and its acceptance by the complainant and the accused with a high sense of responsibility and national attitude.

Until those who still have not assimilated the conditions of Iraqi democracy in all its chapters and at all its junctures assimilate it, and until democracy permeates our behavior as citizens and officials, the program's frame of mind should be translated on the ground so no oppression or unjust treatment will exist during Saddam Husayn's era, whether under the circumstances of the blockade, or after the blockade, whose end is imminent, God willing.

We greet those who are behind this program and those working in it and the one who presents it, wishing the program progress and continuity.

Trade Minister Receives Turkish Businessmen

JN1809122393 Baghdad INA in Arabic 1132 GMT 18 Sep 93

[Excerpt] Baghdad, 18 Sep (INA)—Trade Minister Dr. Muhammad Mahdi Salih today met with a delegation representing the Turkish Society of Businessmen and Industrialists. The delegation is led by Mustafa Shatir Oglo [name as received].

The minister briefed the delegation on the economic circumstances experienced by Iraq as a result of the unjust economic blockade, which has harmed the economic interests of the Iraqi and Turkish peoples as a result of the cessation of trade between the two friendly countries.

Mustafa Shatir Oglo said that the Turkish people and Turkish businessmen support the Iraqi people's determination to end the unjust blockade imposed on them.

He said that Turkish businessmen have a serious interest in establishing mutually beneficial trade and economic relations with Iraq.

The meeting was attended by Falih 'Ali al-Salih, the secretary general of the Iraqi Chambers of Commerce. [passage omitted]

Offers Oil for Lifting Embargo

NC1909155193 (Clandestine) Voice of Iraqi People in Arabic 1400 GMT 19 Sep 93

[Text] It has been learned from the companions of the Iraqi regime's Trade Minister Muhammad Mahdi Salih that on his recent trip to Turkey the Iraqi delegation made a tempting offer to the Turkish Government if the latter agreed to lift the economic embargo and allow Iraqi oil to pass through its territory. According to the offer, the dictatorial regime of Saddam Husayn would provide Turkey with 100,000 oil barrels per day for free and pay $4 in transit fees on each barrel exported from the Turkish port of (Shihan).

The Turkish response is not clear. The Turkish side promised to study the offer, which also requires the Turkish Government to guarantee that the Iraqi oil pipeline does not come under attack by the Iraqi opposition when it operates in the future.

Iraqi Confesses on TV to Being Iranian Spy

NC2009104593 Paris AFP in English 0914 GMT 20 Sep 93

[Text] Baghdad, Sept 19 (AFP)—An Iraqi has made a dramatic televised confession to being an Iranian spy who planted a bomb in the centre of Baghdad last month.

In a television interview late Sunday [19 September], 'Aqil Muhammad Hashim said the Iranian authorities had paid him and two companions 10,000 dollars each to park a car bomb next to the Iraqi Ministry of Culture.

But one of his accomplices got cold feet on the allotted day, August 4, fearing tight security around the ministry, and they parked the primed car near the Ibn-al-Bitar hospital, where it later exploded, injuring five people, according to his televised confession.

Hashim said he came from al-Basrah province in the south of Iraq, where a brief uprising by Iraq's Shiite majority after the Gulf war of 1991 was brutally snuffed out by President Saddam Husayn's armed forces.

He said he had gone to Iran to escape conscription, and had been contacted by secret service officials and asked to plant the bomb.

Iraq has accused Shiite Moslem Iran of fanning the flames of unrest around al-Basrah, a charge the Islamic Republic denies. Iran and Iraq fought a war between 1980 and 1988.

Hashim said he was arrested by Iraqi authorities in al-Basrah, while trying to flee to Iran.

Baghdad accused "agents in the pay of Iran" of planting the bomb on the day of the blast. Tehran denied the allegations and expressed its condolences for the victims.

Knesset Concludes Debate, Votes To Support Accord

Review of 22 Sep Debate

TA2409083093 Tel Aviv HA'ARETZ in Hebrew 23 Sep 93 p A4

[Report by parliamentary correspondent Gid'on Alon]

[Text] Likud Knesset Member [MK] 'Ovadya 'Eli, a deputy Knesset speaker, provided the surprise at the Knesset's marathon debate on the Israel-PLO agreements yesterday. At the beginning of his address, he surprised the plenum by announcing: "I would like to start by making a personal statement that I intend to support the peace agreement." His observation surprised both the opposition and the coalition.

None of the present MK's interrupted his speech. None of the Likud MK's attempted to stop him. "Before I cast my ballot, I would like answers and securities and guarantees to all the vital issues and questions over which the Jewish people in Zion agonize and which they would like answered in a reasonable fashion." He explained that he will be prepared to support the agreement with the PLO provided he is given an explicit guarantee from the prime minister that Jerusalem will remain united under Israeli sovereignty; that a Palestinian state will not be established; that Israel will pursue the struggle against terrorism; that explicit assurances will be provided to guarantee that the Palestinian right of return will not be granted; and that the security of the Jewish settlers in the territories will be safeguarded.

With the exception of MK 'Eli's surprising address, no major dramas took place in the course of the extended political debate, which began at 0900 [0700 GMT] in the morning and ended very late at night. About 70 MK's from all the factions participated in the debate, which was conducted in a predominantly peaceful—sometimes even tedious—atmosphere. Agreement supporters from the coalition defended and praised it fervently, while opposition representatives spoke of the dangers, painting its ramifications in gloomy colors. Contrary to the 21 September opening, foreign television crews were not interested in the Knesset proceedings. Cabinet ministers were also absent from the plenum. During most of the day, one duty minister sat at the government table.

To attract attention, several MK's resorted to gimmicks. MK Avi Yehezqel waved Rabbi 'Ovadya Yosef's photograph from the podium. He implored Rabbi Yosef not to burden his conscience with the possibility of another war and asked him to instruct SHAS [Torah Observing Sephardim] MK's to vote for the agreement in the 24 September Knesset ballot.

MK Yosef Ba-Gad, who is famous for his gimmicks, took out a glass of vodka as he was addressing the plenum, offering it to Prime Minister Yitzhaq Rabin, even though the latter was not in the hall. Two Arab MK's—Walid Sadiq from Meretz and Talib al-Sani' from the Arab Democratic Party—opened their addresses in Arabic.

The first speaker on the morning of 22 September was Labor MK Avraham Burg, who noted that an era in the life of religious Judaism—the era of the encounter of Messiahs—has ended and another era—that of enlightened Judaism, which has both feet on the ground rather than in the messianic days of redemption—has returned.

Labor MK Dalya Itzik sharply attacked Netanyahu, "the great strategist who teaches the chief of staff of the Six-Day War how to conduct the country's security affairs. It is pathetic how he became the Likud leader without having supporters in the Likud. And you, Bibi Netanyahu, dare speak of betrayal! You dare speak of loyalty! Netanyahu is a depraved and irresponsible opposition leader, but I urge Rabin to invite him and let him have his information from the horse's mouth."

Agriculture Minister Ya'aqov Tzur said that he shares the anxiety, concern, and criticism surrounding the agreement but is not party to the fear that seeks to eternalize the status quo. Appealing to the Likud representatives, Tzur pointed out: "You are arousing fears in order to maintain the status quo forever. There is no doubt that the things we will be facing in the near future are not those things of which you are afraid but concerns regarding the test of the Palestinian move toward peace." He stressed that the government's goal is to launch a process of separation between the Israeli and Palestinian peoples, so that Israel will not have to rule over 2 million Palestinians.

Likud MK Moshe Nisim spoke with great emotion: "This debate, which is perhaps the most crucial and important debate ever, should be conducted with a cool head and a warm heart. The public should be told the truth and not deceived. Do not play innocent. You are bearing the name of Camp David in vain. You promised mutual recognition. What is mutual recognition, if not a state? What does jurisdiction over the land mean, if not territory,?" Nisim asked.

Likud MK 'Uzi Landau said that when Shim'on Peres and Yosi Sarid say that the Israeli people will have peace, we all should go put on our armored vests, because they cannot be trusted.

National Religious Party MK Yig'al Bibi pointed out that whoever aspires to attain real and sincere peace should first secure domestic peace, agreement, understanding, and dialogue between all sectors of the public. In his opinion, it is a serious mistake to pit camp against camp, to heighten disputes between groups, to call people names, deny their rights, or prevent them from speaking out.

Economy and Planning Minister Shim'on Shetrit said that his abstention in the cabinet vote on the agreement on principles with the PLO was not a sign of his opposition to the agreement but rather an indication of the responsibility, caution, and attention to detail which, in his opinion, is necessary to continue the process.

Shetrit said that the real test of the document of principles will be its implementation and the process of its realization.

MK Dan Meridor sharply attacked the government and especially Yitzhaq Rabin. "Today's government has the same platform as the New Communist Party (a faction that now makes up part of the Progressive List for Peace and Equality)," Meridor said. "Today Rabin has not only veered to the left; he has gone all the way over to the communists. I believe that the destruction of the peace efforts of an entire generation—their political, settlement, and security efforts—has been devastating." Meridor stressed that "a psychologically exhausted government reached an agreement and gave the other side something no one ever dreamed it would get.... Hundreds of thousands of people in Burj al-Barajinah, Sabra, Shatila, al-Miyah wa Miyah, 'Ayn-al-Hulwah, and other refugee camps in Syria and Jordan are waiting to return home."

Shamir Addresses Session

TA2309113593 Jerusalem Qol Yisra'el in Hebrew 0930 GMT 23 Sep 93

[Statement by Knesset Member Yitzhaq Shamir delivered as the concluding address on behalf of the Likud at the special Knesset debate on the agreements with the PLO—live]

[Text] Mr. Speaker, Knesset Members [MK's]: 15 years ago, on 25 September 1978, the Knesset plenum held a marathon debate to approve the Camp David accords. I was Knesset speaker at the time; therefore, I had to listen to all the speeches. Although I did not altogether approve of those agreements, the recurring comparisons being drawn between those accords and the ones we are now debating force me to take notice of the gap between the issues under debate then and now. First, with whom did we sign the accords then and with whom now? Fifteen years ago, we signed an agreement with President Anwar al-Sadat of Egypt, the largest and most important Arab state, which meant that Egypt had withdrawn from the cycle of Arab war against Israel. Today, the signatory is 'Arafat, not a head of state but the leader of one of the Arab terrorist organizations. We are dealing with somebody who only several days ago was in a state of collapse, bankruptcy, and panhandling and lacked almost any support from the Arab states. Israel, for some reason, decided to pick him out of the garbage and raise his prestige to heights he had never dreamed about. The agreement with Israel led him to the White House as the guest of the U.S. President and to a dialogue with the most senior senators and congressmen.

Since the show in Washington took place, knowledgeable people in the United States have become convinced that 'Arafat will be the president of a Palestinian state, which will be established soon. Fifteen years ago, almost nobody in this House thought a Palestinian state was close at hand. Today, that danger is approaching because of a serious error made impulsively without any prior thought, just as most things are being handled by this government.

Fifteen years ago, nobody thought that following the interim autonomy period, Israel would not have a foothold in Judaea, Samaria, and the Gaza Strip. On the contrary, we had reason to believe that after that period, Israeli sovereignty would be imposed on all of Greater Israel west of the Jordan River, as the late Menahem Begin had planned. Today, agreements with a tight timetable have been placed before the Knesset, and each day that passes brings closer the hour of withdrawals and surrenders. These agreements, according to their dates, will eliminate one by one all our achievements in the Six-Day War. Since 1967, all Israeli Governments have worked hard, each in its own way, to maintain all those achievements. We fought for them on the battlefields and in international arenas. Today, the Israeli Government comes and decides to cease that war. Judaea, Samaria, and the Gaza Strip will be transferred in rapid stages to 'Arafat and his henchmen—first by crawling toward autonomy and then finally in the permanent solution. This is how vital and dear pieces of land, our motherland, are being wrenched from our bodies.

Jerusalem: Israel's exclusive sovereignty over Jerusalem is being weakened in various ways, and the deterioration will continue. The entry of masses of Arab refugees from the 1948 and 1967 wars to our land is being prepared.

The Golan Heights: Despite the pretense of artificial resolve, it will be transferred to the Syrians, and this time with the United States' blessing. Jordan will also get its share, and by the time this terrible plan is completed, the State of Israel will stand weakened, with vital parts severed, within the suffocating borders of 1948 and 1967. Fifteen years ago, we could have been sure that when the interim period ends, many Jewish settlements —whose residents would expand the state's width, secure its borders, and assure a convincing Israeli presence on the hillsides—would grow and develop in Judaea, Samaria, and the Gaza Strip. In our worst nightmares, we did not foresee what an Israeli Government could do to the great settlement program of over 140 Jewish settlements, which dug roots in vital corners of our land and will now be throttled into degeneration and humiliation. Without any land reserves—because state lands have been given to the autonomy council—the settlements will be sentenced to a life without any chance for development, and their safety will depend day and night on constant guarding by Israeli soldiers or policemen, who will safeguard their lives— but for how long? —on land that has suddenly been converted into foreign land. This will be conscious abandonment of the best, most loyal Israeli citizens. It will turn our best sons into prisoners and hostages within a non-Jewish population. What a self-imposed tragedy, of which we should be ashamed!

To conclude, the State of Israel may now be entering a very grave period in the wake of an accumulation of enormous political errors. It is very rare in history that governments make a maximum number of mistakes in a minimum

amount of time. The outcome is unparalleled danger. There was no reason or justification for the State of Israel, which was in an excellent state, to act with such force against itself. This period will be noted in Israel's history as a classic example of how to lose a war despite so many successes on the battlefield. It was, of course, helped by our people's tremendous desire for peace which, because of the lack of a national leadership with clear principles, is not immune to dangers and traps. The trance of its euphoria over a false peace has paralyzed all sense of caution, self-preservation, and national alertness.

Members of the Knesset, I would like to believe that there is only one way to be saved, to stop the downward slide, and that is general elections now, which may give the people time to open their eyes, reflect, think, and return to their senses. With that belief, I would like to send my greetings for a good and wise year to the people of Israel in its difficult hour.

Peres Concludes Debate

TA2309153093 Jerusalem Qol Yisra'el in Hebrew 0942 GMT 23 Sep 93

[Statement by Foreign Minister Shim'on Peres concluding the special three-day Knesset debate on the accords with the PLO—live; speech frequently interrupted by heckling]

[Text] Mr. Speaker, honorable Knesset, before I get involved in polemics, I would like to make a serious response to two or three remarks made in this House, because even now there are (?unclear) things, and for the sake of common sense and not politics, I would like to explain matters.

Knesset Member [MK] Arye Der'i said that we must decide on red lines. The first line, and I believe the entire House supports this, must be to oppose the right of return by the Arabs residents. I would like to explain why somebody like myself, and I will say it without any emotion, believes this is a red line. There are Arabs who ask us why we have the right of return and they do not? My first answer is that had the Jewish people had 22 Jewish states it is doubtful whether the State of Israel would have decided on the right of return to the Land of Israel. That is the first difference between us and them. Second, each of us—on the left and right—understands that the right of return means upsetting the demographic balance. What is called the Jewish state is, in fact, a state which has a Jewish majority. None of us came to live in Israel in order to convert the Jewish state into a non-Jewish state, therefore, MK Arye Der'i, that unifies us all.

The second thing is Jerusalem. Do we need a license from you to unify Jerusalem? It is a fact that Jerusalem is in our hands, it was united by us and will remain united. That is sacred. Do you want to introduce doubts? We united Jerusalem, we will not convert Jerusalem into another Berlin, we will not divide Jerusalem, it will remain united. I want to tell the Likud's Ari'el Sharon that in my view, his speech contained a constructive tone despite the criticism, when compared, of course, to the other Likud speakers. Ari'el, Jerusalem will not be the capital of the autonomy. The autonomy will be set up in Jericho, which will be its administrative center.

MK Yitzhaq Shamir, you attended the Madrid conference, where Haydar 'Abd-al-Shafi said: I am speaking for the PLO, the legitimate leadership of the Palestinians, and you did not move away. You knew it—admit it—that he spoke in the name of the PLO. What right do you have to attack us? You brought the PLO into the negotiations. You are the forefather of the PLO. You spilled my blood. You spread lies about me. MK Shamir, in the name of the Israeli Government—had I been Binyamin Netanyahu I would have shown you the newspaper, since you may have forgotten—heard 'Abd-al-Shafi say that thousands of Palestinian refugees have the right to return home. It happened to Mr. Shamir around that table in Madrid. Shamir sat firmly while 'Abd-al-Shafi said Palestinian Jerusalem is the capital of his homeland and state and that the Israeli annexation of the Arab city is illegal. Shamir continued sitting quietly and remained silent. Shamir lived part of his life in France and became a connoisseur. He is choosy. He does not like 'Arafat. Does he like [King] Husayn? Does he only like Hamas [Islamic Resistance Movement]?

[Shamir shouts indistinct remarks at Peres] Do not shout; you have been wasting our lives for eight years. You are a prime minister who did nothing. You did not bring peace. It is a great day for the Knesset, and you do not understand anything going on, you do not realize with what you are dealing. It is a great day for the majority of the MK's, not such a great day for some of the factions in the Knesset. In actual fact, there is no more debate on the peace accord since it is clear that there is a majority among the people and in the Knesset in favor of it. The only debate is over party discipline in the vote. This side gave its MK's a free vote while the head of the opposition tells his members to do as they are told. 'Ovadya 'Eli, Me'ir Shitrit, As'ad As'ad, and Roni Milo are told to raise their hands and not let their consciences dictate to them. I have also been an opposition leader. Freedom should be given in a vote on such an issue. The majority of the people and the majority of MK's support it.

Many MK's spoke to the point, they referred to the future. Opposition leader Binyamin Netanyahu spoke about the present and the future, but both in one-dimensional terms, as though there is one dimension in life, that of the prophet. What prophecy? Jeremiah without the prophesy of the resurrection of the dead. His reference to the present is also one-dimensional and not updated. He refers to many risks. MK Netanyahu: Are there no risks to Israel today? Is everything safe here at present? Israel does not have enemies? There is no intifadah? In the debate, one thing that did not get addressed is the current situation, as though Israel now is Denmark or Norway or Switzerland. Is Israel not facing dangers at present? Is the only danger to Israel the establishment of a Palestinian state, which I reject, or is

there also a danger that Israel will not be able to be a Jewish state? What is the situation in Gaza today? Do you think life in Gaza is heaven? I hope it will not prevent Me'ir Shitrit from voting the way he should. He gave one of the best speeches. He asked: Is Nabulus in our hands now? He asked whether Nabulus, Janin, and Gaza are in our hands. He asked the right questions.

There are in Gaza this year between 750,000 and 800,000 inhabitants. Within 20 years, there will be almost 2 million residents in the Gaza Strip. The population density leads to violence, the poverty leads to terrorism. I would like to ask whether Gaza is in our hands. I would like to know what is ours in Gaza. The poverty, the population density, the refugee camps, the lack of passports, the lack of a future? What is ours in Gaza? Do we have the money or resources to help 1 million people in Gaza, do we have the funds, can we resolve the refugee problem, do you want to be the lords and masters there? We will have the responsibility, but we will not be able to give them a penny. Can we resolve the Gaza problem? The only way to help Gaza is through economic aid, and that will be done with international help, and the world will never extend it if Likud policy is followed.

Let us be responsible: Do you want the Israel Defense Forces to act against poverty, against overcrowded cities, against the needy? Is that what you want? What do you mean, our Gaza? What is yours there? The refugee camps, the poverty, the shame that is ours? I believe that the Jewish people have a conscience, and they cannot bear to live with such a stain.

I would like to say this to the religious Knesset members: Can you overlook the situation, let these camps stand? Can we? Where have you been? Is there a Jewish justice? Do we not remember our own misery in [ancient] Egypt? I would like to say this: Can the Jewish people have a famine-stricken Gaza Strip on its conscience? Can it bear the poverty and the hostility which cause knife-wielding? The knives, in turn, caused the closure, which I support. They have no jobs, and having no passports, they have nowhere to turn, and yet it is being persistently said that Gaza is ours. Ours? It is our disgrace. In the words of MK Me'ir Shitrit: This agreement may possibly create new national priorities, and then we will perhaps start seriously addressing social welfare problems, our own society's problems. Can we deal with Gaza's welfare? Think of our own poor first! Think of our own country's problems first!

And then there is, of course, the security problem. I have to say that in this sense, it will naturally be more difficult, because more settlements will have to be defended. However, why should IDF soldiers serve as a barrier between Hamas and the PLO? Why do we, as a nation, want to put another nation's affairs in order? Why should we use weapons to fight an Arab minority and use weapons to protect an Arab majority when neither side wants us? Can one nation be the policeman of another? Where is the logic in that? The IDF, the Border Police, the Israel Police will all have an easier task. Ask the reserve soldiers whether they want it. Let them defend their country rather than police Gaza. They are the Israeli Defense Forces, not the Gaza police force.

I would like to quote some more. Here is another quote from Me'ir Shitrit, whose speech, by the way, was the best of all: What is our alternative? Will we close the door on peace? That will bring us back to the intifadah and to war. I am telling the Likud—I am quoting Me'ir Shitrit—and the Labor: Neither the Likud nor the Labor government managed to curb the intifadah. And I am telling Me'ir Shitrit: You are absolutely right. It is time to change the policy, not the government. The intifadah raged under the Likud government, too; nothing abated, terrible assassinations were perpetrated. It is now time to change our policy rather than our government.

Violence is caused by two things: hostility and hunger. We want to put an end both to hostility and to hunger. We want to tackle the situation from the root, not from the crown. Today offers a good opportunity to end the hostility; putting an end to hunger is up to the world, but the world will not do it unless there is peace. Otherwise, fundamentalism will surge and rise.

Today we are the policemen of Gaza—albeit no ordinary policemen: We are one nation policing another. We, a nation with its own laws and legislative authority, are policing a nation which can neither legislate nor defend itself. And to quote Me'ir Shitrit again: The country has never been ours. Israeli citizens, he said, had been afraid to hang around in Nabulus, Hebron, Janin, Gaza, and in East Jerusalem too, he said.

With regard to Jerusalem, I would like to quote from the speech of MK Refa'el Eytan, whose facts, I am sure, were utterly accurate. Basing his remarks on mysterious and anonymous sources, he said: The secret Israel-PLO agreement speaks of a freeze on construction in Jerusalem—notice the wording—from the day the document is signed until the termination of the negotiations on the city's permanent status. We signed the document a week ago; has construction in Jerusalem stopped, Raful [Eytan's nickname]? Has anyone given instructions to stop it? You spoke in such assertive terms: No construction at all since the signing day. Did you see anyone stopping construction? Did you see anyone giving instructions to stop construction? And MK Raful added: If such a document exists, why are you hiding it? For a simple reason, Raful: Because it does not exist, because there is nothing to hide. He went on to say: Will you deny it, if there is no document? Yes, you can relax: We are hereby denying. I have a lot of respect for you, and I do not want you to suffer in vain. Therefore, I am telling you: There is no such agreement; there is neither a secret nor an open agreement to this effect. There is only one agreement: that Jerusalem is outside the autonomy.

I would like to note that I usually respect MK Beni Begin's remarks, which are usually accurate. I would like to tell MK Beni Begin, the accurate man who deals with delicate things of the past: You spoke of conciliation and

arbitration, and you asked about the fate of Jerusalem. I am really surprised that a man of your intelligence should not know that conciliation and arbitration pertain solely to the autonomy period, while Jerusalem is outside the autonomy. There is to be no conciliation or arbitration; Jerusalem is outside the autonomy.

[At this point, the Knesset speaker, having received Peres' consent, allows two questions from the plenum. MK Refa'el Eytan says: "I will read from a document issued by the Municipality of Jerusalem: The secret Israel-PLO agreement speaks of freezing the construction in Jerusalem from the day the document is signed until the termination of negotiations on the city's permanent status." A Qol Yisra'el correspondent notes: "Having glanced at MK Eytan's document, MK 'Imanu'el Zismann said: This is not a municipality document; this is a National Religious Party document." The second question is not asked at this point.]

I would like to tell MK Refa'el Eytan: There is no secret document either on Jerusalem or....[prolonged catcalls] Raful, you have been sold damaged goods. There is no such agreement, either secret or public.

With regard to conciliation and arbitration, I would like to say that neither side can have arbitration without the consent of the other when one of the following three issues is at stake: A. Arbitration can take place only during autonomy, but even then, it cannot be applied either to Jerusalem or the settlements. B. It can happen only if we agree that a certain issue should be arbitrated. C. It can happen only if we agree to arbitration in the first place. Then what do we have here? Neither Jerusalem nor the settlements, and no arbitration without our consent. [MK Beni Begin is now allowed to pose a mostly indistinct question about the status of Jerusalem]

Knesset members, is it conceivable that a Palestinian delegation that comes to negotiate the permanent status will refrain from raising the issue of Jerusalem? What is the difference? These are mere polemics, anachronistic polemics.

With regard to settlements: The present Government of Israel is committed to maintaining the security of all existing settlements in Judaea, Samaria, and the Gaza Strip, and we will do so most seriously, honorably, and responsibly. Furthermore, we will protect them although it is very difficult and very expensive, and despite the fact that the Likud's hopes to have the settlements help the IDF defend the country, instead of the IDF defending the settlements, may have been dashed. The IDF will defend the settlements. I would like to tell MK Ari'el Sharon, who wanted protection through territorial continuity: There will be operative continuity, namely, the IDF troops will be able to move in order to protect the settlements in case of need.

I anticipate three principal tasks. One is bringing peace for the Jewish people and the entire region: our Arab neighbors and our Palestinian neighbors. This is a noble objective befitting the Jewish people's heritage of justice and peace. The second task: An enormous opportunity to strengthen the State of Israel has arisen, but not with territories populated by Arabs, but rather with open areas like the Negev, which will beckon to Jews from the CIS, Ethiopia, and other places. The era of hostility is over; it is now time to welcome immigrants and settle our country.

Now for the economic aspect. Knesset members, we learned after World War II that a nation can gain independence while forfeiting its true substance. [Labor MK Zismann is now permitted to make an observation. He accuses MK Eytan of falsifying the origin of the document he read.] After World War II, tens of thousands of Algerians sacrificed their lives for their country's independence, but instead of independence, there was tragedy. Some 50 percent of that nation is unemployed, there is no equality for women; the nation is rebelling against the corrupt regime, and as a result, moving on toward extremism. And here is my central thesis: Without the genuine blend of a strong army, a truly deterrent power, with political wisdom and economic investment, none of the nations will have any future here. This combination, rather than segregation, is the real thing. Weapons also require money, as do armies, and education.

I would like to note here that I am not seeking to implement the erstwhile Zionist idea because I realize it does not work. What was that Zionist idea? We used to say that we will heap benefits on the Arabs. How did the Arabs take it? As patronizing, as a takeover, as something negative.

Neither do I propose that we talk of economic cooperation. Why? Because the Arabs believe that the State of Israel wants to dominate the region. We do not want to do the Arabs any favors. I am not even suggesting economic cooperation with the Arabs. All I am telling the Arabs is this: There are problems that will remain unresolved unless we tackle them jointly. We should make a joint effort only when problems are insolvable without such a joint effort.

I will explain. For instance, we cannot curb the arms race without a regional accord. Israel will not diminish its security and military efforts unless the entire region does likewise. Today the region spends $50 billion on weapons. What for? Therefore, we—the Likud really—have set up a joint committee to discuss arms control. That committee has begun its work, and its work makes a lot of sense. I would like to cite another example: One of the spheres which can greatly benefit both Israel and the Arabs is tourism. Without quiet, there will be no significant tourism in this region. Tourism will create hundreds of thousands of jobs. It is the most modern, the most political industry, since it generates a desire to maintain the peace. Another example: The Middle East will be worthless without a joint transportation and communications infrastructure. My fourth example: The Arabs have an area of 13 million square kilometers, only

11 million of which are fertile. And they are expected to lose a quarter of this land over the next 11 years.

I want you to know that one of the things that makes me proud—besides the IDF—is Israeli agriculture. It has had colossal successes! We will never forget how kibbutzim and moshavim have been mistreated. The Food and Health Federation [preceding four words in English] has published some very interesting facts. It said that due to technological backwardness, the Middle East will require a period of one generation—25 years—to double its agricultural production. By the way, the Middle East population will be 500 million, instead of 230 million, in 25 years. Even if productivity doubles, there will still be no food surplus.

Now for Israel: Within one generation—25 years from 1950 to 1975—our agricultural production grew 12 times; 1200 percent within 25 years is an unprecedented achievement—and this is not our own definition.

Moreover, most of the Middle East does not have a particularly fertile farming land. The desert occupies a large part of it, and there is serious water shortage. Now listen to what is being said about Israel: In the 1950's, the contribution of water and land to the advancement of agriculture was 60 to 70 percent, while the contribution of technology, research, education, and planning amounted to 30 to 40 percent. Yet in the past decade, research, technology, organization, planning, and education were 95 percent, while water and land were only 5 percent. This is the most advanced agriculture in the whole world, and the Arabs—as well as China, India, Kazakhstan—seek this tremendous Israeli expertise.

We do not want to dominate anyone, and we do not want to do anyone any favors. We are ready to share our experience with all nations. David Ben-Gurion was serious when he referred to this nation as the chosen people, a light to the world. We will continue in this spirit.

Thus, only a security-political-economic combination, only the combination of the world, the region, and us in every sphere....[pauses]

And I would like to tell those who are constantly looking back to past wars: The wars of the past are nothing like those of the future in a world rife with missiles and nonconventional weapons. These things have no answer except for the combination of economy, politics, and security. This combination is reflected perfectly in this important agreement, which was endorsed by the prime minister, as well as the cabinet members. I have said the same to the Arabs: In the Middle East, we can buy a ticket to one of two places—either revert back to the darkness of the Middle Ages of fundamentalism, or to the 21st century. The 20th century is over, done with. We can march either backward or forward. All those who are pulling us backward in the name of nonexistent things do not see how things have changed, do not see their country, do not understand their fellow Israelis, do not appreciate their talents. This is a country poor in crude oil but rich in brainpower, a country that can create more with intelligence than with an oppressive rule.

On the eve of Yom Kippur, I have the right to say just this once to this audience: No one in this country has been maligned and libeled as often as I have been. My life is too short to be able to refute all the lies about me, starting with the identity of my late mother down to the factories I was supposed to own. I refuse to let this be, and you have no moral right to behave as you have. Enough of your false allegations, your mud-slinging, your hurting me and making things up about me.

Despite my bitter feelings, I would like to say in the spirit of Yom Kippur: My anger has never interfered with my understanding of what is right, although everything I have ever done generated opposition. It happened many times. I am proud to work with Yitzhaq Rabin for a genuine peace for the State of Israel. We do not serve each other; we serve a great and genuine cause, a historic cause. You can see that the nation is not with you. Look at what goes on in your own camp!

Despite my anger, I will recite this prayer: Our Father, our King, remember thy mercy and suppress thy wrath, and vanquish all plague, sword, hunger, captivity, evil, and all disease, and all disaster, and all evil edicts, and vain rancor. I am past 70, and I remember what a Greek sage once said. He said: What is the difference between war and peace? In war, he said, old folk bury their young, while in peace it is the other way around. I would like to make the world younger, I would like the young to own the world, the future, to have life and security. I am calling on everyone, including the religious people, to vote for the young generation, to let them live their lives in peace, security, and justice in accordance with the heritage of the Jewish people.

MK's Vote 61-50 To Endorse Accord

TA2309125493 Jerusalem Qol Yisra'el in Hebrew 1200 GMT 23 Sep 93

[Text] The Knesset has voted confidence in the government and endorsed the agreements Israel signed with the PLO. Sixty-one Knesset members [MK's] supported the agreements and 50 opposed them. Eight MK's abstained, including five SHAS [Torah Observing Sephardim] MK's and three Likud MK's: Roni Milo, Me'ir Shitrit, and As'ad As'ad. SHAS MK Yosef 'Azran did not attend the debate.

The Knesset rejected all the draft resolutions summing up the debate submitted by the opposition factions of the House. The prime minister said he would consider the draft resolution submitted by the Likud, Tzomet, the National Religious Party, and Agudat Yisra'el a vote of confidence. This resolution was also defeated, although the three Likud MK's who had earlier abstained in the vote on the agreements with the PLO voted for it.

Our correspondent Yo'el Nir reports that in his speech, MK Arye Der'i had intended to call on Labor and Likud to set up a unity government but refrained from doing so at the last minute.

Rabin on Support for Government

TA2309133493 Jerusalem Qol Yisra'el in Hebrew 1239 GMT 23 Sep 93

[Interview with Prime Minister Yitzhaq Rabin by political correspondent Shlomo Raz in the Knesset "a few minutes ago"—recorded]

[Text] [Raz] Mr. Prime Minister, is a majority of 61 Knesset members [MK's] enough to continue the political moves?

[Rabin] What was submitted to the Knesset today and on the first day of this debate was a request to ratify the exchange of letters between the PLO and Israel, the agreement on the declaration of principles, and the agenda for the continuation of the negotiations between Jordan and Israel. In the main vote, voicing confidence or nonconfidence in the government for the purpose of ratifying these accords, 61 MK's voted in favor, 50 against, and 8 abstained. In my eyes, this is a majority in excess of 50 percent. There was a difference of 11 MK's, almost 10 percent of the members of the House, between those supporting and those opposed to the agreement. This gives the government freedom of action to fulfill what it presented to the Knesset.

[Raz] Does this also apply to other future plans?

[Rabin] I distinguish between two issues: Endorsing the accords submitted to the Knesset and the problem of the composition of the coalition. A distinction must be made: of the 61 MK's, 56 were coalition members and 5 who were not. Six coalition members abstained, one of them was absent from the hall. Therefore, there are two issues here: We have no problem as far as implementation of the agreements goes, and as for maintaining a stable coalition, we will deal with that after Yom Kippur.

[Raz] Is SHAS [Torah Observing Sephardim] in or out of the coalition?

[Rabin] At this moment, it has not yet left the coalition. I will not deal with that today. As you know, part of SHAS' reasons and difficulties are not necessarily related to the issue discussed in the Knesset today. I think they have other reasons, which I understand, although I will not elaborate on it today. SHAS has quite a few good reasons to be disappointed about a few things.

[Raz] Mr. Rabin, how do you explain, or what is the meaning of, the fact that three Likud MK's abstained?

[Rabin] I do not think it is my duty to explain that. I think the Likud committed a gross mistake by not addressing itself in a matter-of-fact manner to the substance of the agreements. Peace proposals were raised in the past that entailed very painful decisions. Giving away the entire Sinai, uprooting settlements, destroying Yamit, setting the precedent whereby in exchange for peace one gives back everything and uproots every Israeli presence—all this was done by the Likud in order to attain peace with Egypt. We gave our hand to it, although today it acts as a boomerang against us in the negotiations with Syria. Let there be no illusions about it. This agreement does not entail the uprooting of even one settlement and allows the IDF [Israel Defense Forces] to maintain responsibility for the security of the settlements, of Israelis, and of external security, and for its deployment in the territories accordingly. What is more, the Palestinian self-rule in the territories will have no power over united Jerusalem, which will remain under Israel's rule—an achievement which had so far never been attained with any Arab partner, but was reached this time with an Arab partner. The Likud could have adopted a more supportive attitude.

[Raz] Finally, let me ask you: You mentioned Syria. How do matters stand with it? There have been various reports and statements by President Mubarak as if Israel is on the verge of reaching an agreement with Syria.

[Rabin] I very much appreciate President Mubarak as the leader of the largest Arab country for his adherence and commitment to the continuation and expansion of the peace process. However, his remarks reflect his own views. We want to pursue the negotiations with Syria, Jordan, and Lebanon. However, in my view, the main effort today must be on the implementation of the agreement reached with the PLO. I have said this before and I will reiterate it now: For dozens of years, people in the Arab world and elsewhere said that the Palestinian-Jewish or Palestinian-Israeli conflict was the core of the Arab-Israeli conflict. I do not want to judge whether this was right or wrong, but the fact that we started to attack this conflict and are trying to solve it together must have an impact on the attitude of the Arab countries and the world at large toward us. That is why I consider the main focus to be the implementation of this agreement while pursuing negotiations with our three neighboring Arab states that have not yet made peace with us.

[Raz] Mr. Prime Minister, thank you very much.

Rabin on Possibility of Elections

TA2309201793 Jerusalem Israel Television Network in Hebrew 1900 GMT 23 Sep 93

[Interview with Prime Minister Yitzhaq Rabin by Ya'aqov Ahime'ir following the vote in the Knesset on 23 September; place not given—recorded]

[Excerpts] [Ahime'ir] Do you consider elections or a national referendum now?

[Rabin] No. My, the government's, present goal is to focus on the implementation of the agreement currently. What will happen in nine months—when we reach the stage of summing up all agreements, of examining the

first stage of implementation—will it be necessary to hold a national referendum or elections then? We will consider it then.

[Ahime'ir] Do you expect an increased U.S. involvement now in bringing Israeli and Syrian positions closer together? What is your opinion about President Mubarak's declaration that an Israeli-Syrian agreement on the Golan Heights is close?

[Rabin] [passage omitted] The Egyptian president told me that he gave his approval in principle to the establishment of refineries based on Israeli-Egyptian cooperation, although he has not allowed this with any other country. He allowed the Egyptian electricity and energy minister to begin a dialogue with his Israeli counterpart on linking up the electricity grids, on examining the possibility of linking them up for use in the Gaza Strip and in general. There are additional issues that will better demonstrate normalization between us and Egypt, a thing that was held up for 14 years.

Peres Interviewed After Vote

TA2309134493 Jerusalem Qol Yisra'el in Hebrew 1220 GMT 23 Sep 93

[Interview with Foreign Minister Shim'on Peres by political correspondent Shlomo Raz in the Knesset "a few minutes ago"—recorded]

[Text] [Raz] Mr. Foreign Minister, the government attained the Knesset's vote of confidence as well as a majority in support of its policy line. What is the next step?

[Peres] To build a new Middle East.

[Raz] Could you be more specific with regard to the political negotiations?

[Peres] I have said this before, and people must understand it: We cannot protect the country without protecting its citizens or establishing new relations with our neighbors. In other words, we need a security-political-economic combination, and we will build such a combination.

[Raz] How do you explain SHAS' [Torah Observing Sephardim] abstention in the vote? Do you consider it a vote of confidence in your future policies?

[Peres] I see it as a continuation of our partnership.

[Raz] Sir, thank you very much.

Peres on Next Steps in Talks

TA2309164093 Tel Aviv Educational Television Network in Hebrew 1500 GMT 23 Sep 93

[Studio interview with Foreign Minister Shim'on Peres by Yisra'el Segal on the "New Evening" program—live]

[Excerpt] [Segal] Good evening to you Foreign Minister Shim'on Peres. Now that the agreement was approved in the Knesset, what are the next political moves?

[Peres] We are only at the beginning of the road. In my opinion, if we do not establish a new Middle East from the military, political, and economic viewpoints, we will not guarantee the future of our people and the young generation.

[Segal] Are additional meetings with PLO officials planned? Is there coordination? When will the talks resume?

[Peres] There will be two things. The formal talks in Washington will continue so as to keep up the negotiations and try to complete them with regard to those places and issues which were not included in the current agreement. In two or three weeks we will also start meetings on the so-called Oslo track so as to iron out those matters which are still unresolved. In fact, today we have informal contacts with the PLO leadership. They, on their part, need to appoint three or four people. We will do likewise. These people will then begin the informal contacts.

[Segal] Informal contacts—does that mean that there is a red line between you and Yasir 'Arafat?

[Peres] Look, I am afraid of red lines. I prefer regular lines. I am told not to talk on the phone. One may think that this entire country is full of bugging devices and eavesdroppers. From my experience I know that in our country only people whose work involves security or other dangers are bugged. Otherwise, the telephones are free. One can use them, and I have nothing to worry about.

[Segal] Yasir 'Arafat in China yesterday condemned terrorism. Is it true that it was necessary to exert pressure on him through the Norwegian foreign minister?

[Peres] No pressure. It was simply necessary to remind him that there is such a commitment, that time is pressing. In the Knesset, several members said that he does not condemn terror, so we told him of this, that he should issue a condemnation immediately, as he indeed did.

[Segal] Have we received from the PLO the names of those who will negotiate the Gaza and Jericho issues with us, or are we still awaiting an answer?

[Peres] We will receive this within a few days.

[Segal] Mr. Peres, do you believe, as Rabin does, that we are not pressed on the Syrian issue, that we should give it time so that the Israeli public can digest it, or should we still move on both tracks?

[Peres] Look, generally, we want an overall agreement. The question you are asking is largely theoretical though, since in my opinion, al-Asad himself has not yet descended from his atmospheric heights to the ground of realism.

[Segal] Well, he is waiting for us to get off the Golan Heights.

[Peres] It is utterly impossible for Israel to address itself to such a realistic, down-to-earth issue as the Golan Heights without having very realistic proposals regarding peace and security issues. Without receiving a clear picture on the security issue primarily but on the peace one as well, we will not draw maps.

[Segal] In other words, President Mubarak's declaration that this issue is going to be finished any day now is a bit too optimistic then?

[Peres] Look, President Mubarak is full of good will and has also played a very positive role in everything which has happened to date. President Mubarak believes the sides should be pressed and is correct as far as he is concerned. Therefore, I understand his attempt to inject life, quick and fiery life, into these negotiations. I believe that the real difficulty lies with the other side though. [passage omitted]

Netanyahu: Likud Achieved Goal

TA2309195493 Jerusalem Israel Television Network in Arabic 1730 GMT 23 sep 93

[Interview with Likud leader Binyamin Netanyahu by parliament affairs correspondent Eli Nisan following the vote in the Knesset on 23 September—recorded in Hebrew with Arabic subtitles]

[Text] [Nisan] Mr. Netanyahu, 61 Knesset members [MK's] were in favor of the agreement with the PLO, while 50 opposed it. You did not expect this result, did you?

[Netanyahu] We set a goal for ourselves. Exactly two weeks ago, when the prime minister determined that he expected 70 MK's, we decided that we would work for 61, so that his majority would be shriveled and reflect the fact that he relies on PLO supporters. We set this goal for ourselves and have achieved it.

[Nisan] Three Likud MK's abstained. Are matters in the Likud going somewhat awry under your leadership?

[Netanyahu] Every opposition party has such phenomena, which are very grave in my eyes, especially in such a vote, since people are thus expressing their personal rather than the general party's view. I believe we will need to consider the necessary steps on this matter. Still, I have no doubt that the main thing achieved today was that it was proven that this government has a very narrow parliamentary majority, and I think it cannot—not only from the viewpoint of leaning on this Meretz and PLO majority, but also from the viewpoint of its general performance in recent months and weeks—maintain the country's vital interests.

This agreement was passed in the Knesset. This is a fact, and we need to look to the future now. There are four major dangers that should be foiled, that we should prevent from happening. First, we should guarantee the Israeli citizens' security, and eliminate any limitation on IDF [Israel Defense Forces] action in the area up to the Jordan River. Second, we must guarantee the security and integrity of Jerusalem, which is in danger now already. Third, we should take care to curb any manifestation of the refugees' right of return. Fourth, we must care for the safety and well-being of the Jewish settlements which, in the final analysis, serve as the only guarantee for the prevention of a Palestinian state. I do not believe that this government, this weak and shriveled government, can cope with these dangers. It cannot be relied on. We will act to promote these goals. This is our intention in the current, new reality, and we will also act, as soon as possible, to bring about elections so that the people can decide who will lead us from now on.

Rabinovich Denies Agreement Initialed With Syria

TA2409063793 Jerusalem Qol Yisra'el in Hebrew 0505 GMT 24 Sep 93

[Interview with Itamar Rabinovich, ambassador to the United States and head of the delegation to the negotiations with Syria, by Arye Golan in Washington on 23 September—recorded]

[Text] [Golan] Ambassador Rabinovich, has an agreement already been initialed between Israel and Syria?

[Rabinovich] No. There is no agreement between Syria and Israel, and no such agreement has been initialed. All the reports about such agreements are baseless.

[Golan] The source of these reports is an unnamed senior minister from the Labor party. This minister told 'AL HAMISHMAR that Israel has agreed to withdraw from the Golan Heights and recognize Syria's sovereignty over the area. Syria, for its part, has committed itself to full normalization in its relations with Israel. The senior minister asserted that these understandings will take effect in exactly four months.

[Rabinovich] Well, I do not know to whom the report is attributed, and I certainly cannot argue the issue with anonymous sources. To the best of my knowledge, Israel has not delivered such commitments to Syria. We made no such commitments to the Syrians; neither these reported commitments nor the affixed timetable have any basis in reality.

[Golan] Where, then, do things actually stand now in the peace negotiations between Israel and Syria?

[Rabinovich] The immediate background to the recent events was Secretary of State Christopher's visit to the region, which was followed by the 11th round of talks between Syria and Israel. The talks held by the secretary of state in Damascus and Jerusalem contributed to an improvement in the atmosphere and helped put the Syrian-Israeli negotiations on a more positive track. Therefore, as opposed to the ninth and 10th rounds of talks, the 11th round witnessed certain progress with regard to the phrasing of the document of principles

which we are working on. There was definitely a more pleasant atmosphere at the talks. The breakthrough on the Palestinian track came against this background and obviously went on to create a new situation with regard to the overall negotiations.

[Golan] Now, against the background of the breakthrough with the Palestinians, there are also reports of plans for a direct meeting between Syrian President Hafiz al-Asad and Prime Minister Yitzhaq Rabin in two months in order to bring about a similar breakthrough.

[Rabinovich] I believe that this report is also incorrect. We have clarified to the Syrians— mainly through the United States but also through our own statements—that we remain committed to holding serious negotiations with Syria. Nonetheless, certain developments have taken place, and there has been a breakthrough on the Palestinian track. The first priority for all of us right now should be to anchor the agreements with the Palestinians in reality, to implement them and translate them into progress on the ground. Any such progress will contribute to establishing greater support and trust for the peace process. Ultimately, this must also help negotiations between Syria and Israel. Therefore, we believe it is also in Syria's interest to help implement and expand the agreements we have already reached with the Palestinians. That will pave the way for positive progress on the Syrian-Israeli track after what we call a period to digest and shape these developments is over.

[Golan] Amb. Rabinovich, both Israeli Foreign Minister Shim'on Peres and Syrian Foreign Minister Faruq al-Shar' will be in Washington in a few days. Will they meet?

[Rabinovich] As far as I know, they will not meet. This is not because we are not interested in holding such a meeting. For a long time, Syria has rejected holding any meetings outside the framework of the talks in the State Department building, and that remains the case today. Syria is opposed to upgrading the talks to the political level, and it opposes any act that may demonstrate a greater degree of normalization in Syrian-Israeli relations.

[Golan] In conclusion, would it be correct to say that the Syrians are really waiting for the U.S. proposal on an Israeli- Syrian agreement currently being prepared by the administration? Perhaps Secretary of State Christopher will bring this proposal to the region when he visits the Middle East in several weeks?

[Rabinovich] Once again, you are alluding to reports which I find myself obliged to deny. There is no such proposal. The Americans are helping the negotiations between Syria and Israel by holding talks with both sides and serving as a channel through which both parties can exchange their views. They have not presented any bridging proposal until now, nor do they intend to do so. Our working arrangement and relations with the U.S. Administration are such that I do not believe it would move in such a direction without at least informing us of its intentions. Therefore, I can say that this report is also baseless and unfounded. Consequently, any conjecturing on the basis of this report would also be totally unfounded.

[Golan] Thank you, Amb. Rabinovich.

Closure Imposed on Territories for Yom Kippur

TA2309173393 Jerusalem Qol Yisra'el in Hebrew 1700 GMT 23 Sep 93

[Text] A closure on the territories during Yom Kippur: Beginning at 0200 tonight [0000 GMT on 24 September], the residents of Judaea, Samaria, and the Gaza Strip will not be permitted to either enter or leave Israel. The closure will be in effect for 48 hours, or until 0200 on Sunday [26 September].

Plan for Mass Release of Palestinian Prisoners Denied

TA2409060493 Jerusalem Qol Yisra'el in English 0500 GMT 24 Sep 93

[Text] Security officials have denied a report that Israel would release 11,000 Palestinian prisoners in the framework of its agreement with the PLO. The magazine THE JERUSALEM REPORT stated that thousands of security detainees would be moved from jails in the territories into Israeli prisons and eventually back to jails in the territories during autonomy.

Former Prime Minister Denies Cabinet Reshuffle

JN2409080093 Amman AL-BILAD in Arabic 22 Sep 93 p 1

[Text] Political sources in Jordan have said that former Prime Minister Tahir al-Masri is a candidate to form a new Jordanian government to replace Dr. 'Abd-al-Salam al-Majali's government, and that his appointment is dictated by current conditions.

The sources, which have begun to speak strongly about a cabinet reshuffle, stressed that al-Masri will form the government in case the parliamentary elections are postponed and the dissolved House of Representatives is called to convene. Al-Masri is a member of parliament and enjoys the support of the majority of members in the House of Representatives, which forced al-Masri's former government to resign after it decided to join the peace process.

Contacted by AL-BILAD over the phone, al-Masri categorically denied these reports, stressing that they are merely rumors and he has no information in that regard. He ruled out the possibility of a cabinet reshuffle, particularly at this time.

EC Chairman Claes Arrives for Talks 23 Sep

Outlines Purpose of Visit

JN2309192593 Amman Jordan Television Network in Arabic 1700 GMT 23 Sep 93

[Text] Belgian Foreign Minister Willy Claes, the current EC chairman, arrived in Amman from Damascus this evening. During his visit he will have talks with several ranking officials on current Middle East developments.

The Belgian minister spoke to Jordanian Television:

[Begin recording in English with Arabic subtitles] [Claes] ...And to hear what Jordanians think about the evolution in the region. Secondly, I've come to explain how the European Community sees the evolution of the peace process in the Middle East, and to explain what the Community is ready to do in order to stimulate the peace process, and, if necessary, to support the economic development in the region. We have some specific ideas about this, but, of course, we are here to put some ideas and proposals on the table.

[Correspondent Maha al-Sha'ir] Reports say the European Community is going to contribute about $600 million to a Palestinian state. Is that true? Is that confirmed?

[Claes] Well, first of all, may I stress that this is not new. We've always been the most important of donors to the Palestinians. Some 1 billion ECU, that's some $1.3 billion in 20 years. So, we are ready to increase this. I think that tomorrow some Palestinian experts will be in Brussels to discuss what the priorities are, what projects have to be financed, developing so, and so on. [end recording]

Confers With al-Majali

JN2409054193 Amman Radio Jordan in English 0430 GMT 24 Sep 93

[Text] The Prime Minister Dr. 'Abd-al-Salam al-Majali received the Belgian Foreign Minister and the current head of the European Community, Mr. Willy Claes.

During the meeting, the two sides reviewed the latest developments in the peace process, in addition to the Palestinian-Israeli agreement and the Jordanian-Israeli Declaration of Principles.

The prime minister asserted Jordan's adherence to the peace process and the principle of land for peace as stipulated in UN Resolutions 242 and 338, in addition to the restoration of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people. Dr. al-Majali expressed Jordan's support to the Palestinian-Israeli agreement and hoped progress would take place in other tracks.

The Belgian minister, on his part, praised the role played by his majesty the king in the peace process and his efforts in achieving a just and comprehensive peace. He also outlined the European Community's stand with regard to the peace process and its keenness to sound the Jordanian view with regards to the latest developments in the area.

Later, the Belgian minister left for home after a one-day visit to Syria and Jordan.

Holds News Conference, Departs

JN2409082493 Amman Radio Jordan Network in Arabic 0400 GMT 24 Sep 93

[Excerpts] Prime Minister Dr. 'Abd-al-Salam al-Majali yesterday received Willy Claes, the Belgian foreign minister and current EC chairman. [passage omitted]

Willy Claes, the Belgian foreign minister and current EC chairman, said he was satisfied with the Jordanian stand on the peace process, describing it as practical and noting that it contributes to an optimistic atmosphere that will help push the peace process forward and bring practical benefits to Jordan and the region's states and peoples.

Claes was speaking at a news conference at Amman Airport before he left Amman for Brussels last night at the end of his one-day visit to Syria and Jordan.

Answering a question on EC aid to Jordan for hosting refugees and displaced people, he stressed that the EC's task is not confined to aiding the Palestinians alone, especially since the peace process requires support for all the region's states so that peace and stability can be achieved. He said that Jordan is one of the important states, noting that it is necessary to wait for the results of the international financial aid conference that will be held in Washington on 1 October.

Minister, Russia's Adamishin View Peace Process

JN2309164493 Amman Radio Jordan Network in Arabic 1500 GMT 23 Sep 93

[Text] At his office this afternoon, Talal Sat'an al-Hasan, minister of state for foreign affairs, received Anatoliy Adamishin, Russia's first deputy foreign minister and his delegation. The two officials reviewed the latest developments in the peace process, especially with respect to the Palestinian-Israeli agreement and the declaration of the Jordanian-Israeli joint agenda.

Al-Hasan explained His Majesty King Husayn's important and effective role. He stressed Jordan's firm commitment to the peace process. He recalled Jordan's role during the past three decades to boost peace efforts, support the Palestinian people's legitimate rights, and uphold their independent identity. In this regard, he noted Jordan's position during the Rabat summit of 1974, the disengagement decision of 1988, the provision of an umbrella for the Palestinian delegation's participation in the peace process, and the achievements that resulted from that.

Al-Hasan pointed out the importance of coordination among concerned Arab parties, and Jordan's commitment to it, to meet the joint Arab interest. The minister explained Jordan's economic burdens stemming from the repercussions of the Palestine question and the situation in the region.

For his part, the guest praised King Husayn's honorable stands and continuous endeavors for peace. He praised the support of his majesty the king and the Jordanian government for the Palestinian-Israeli agreement. He described this support as a strong boost for peace. Stressing the region's importance and stability, he affirmed his government's eagerness to work to achieve a just and comprehensive peace in the region and to achieve progress on other tracks.

The two sides discussed bilateral relations and means of promoting them in the interest of the two peoples.

The guest presented a briefing on the recent developments in his country .

The meeting was attended by the Foreign Ministry secretary general and the Russian ambassador in Amman.

Abu-Nuwar Denies 'Distorted' REUTER Report

JN2309183293 Amman Jordan Television Network in Arabic 1700 GMT 23 Sep 93

[Text] Information Minister Dr. Ma'n Abu-Nuwar has emphasized that he did not make the statement transmitted by REUTER from Amman this evening which contains distorted news about depriving Jordanians of Palestinian origin of Jordanian nationality.

In a statement to the JORDANIAN NEWS AGENCY, Dr. Abu-Nuwar said Jordanian nationality is protected by King Husayn and the Constitution as a basic human right of every citizen. The minister emphasized any citizen of Jordanian nationality cannot be deprived of this nationality. No constitutional or administrative agency has the power to deprive the citizen of this nationality or take it from him.

As for elections, all Jordanians of any origin who registered their names have the right to vote in the next general elections. The minister also emphasized: The Joint Jordanian-Palestinian Committee has not discussed the subject of local government elections in Palestine and will not discuss this subject in the near future. The Government of Jordan will not, in any way, force any Jordanian citizen of Palestinian origin to vote or not to vote in local government elections in Palestine. Anyway, he said, these elections are an internal Palestinian affair in which the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan does not interfere.

Hizballah Official on 'Massacre,' Peace Talks

NC2309200893 Beirut AL-'AHD in Arabic 17 Sep 93 p 22-23

[Interview with Hizballah Political Bureau Chief al-Hajj Husayn al-Khalil by Najib al-Sayyid and Wahid Suwayd in Beirut on 14 September]

[Excerpts] [AL-'AHD] Let us begin with the crime, the massacre [reference to the killing and wounding of several people during a Hizballah demonstration in Beirut on 13 September]. Why did the government prevent the demonstration in such a bloody way?

[Al-Khalil] Our position toward the capitulation [peace] process is clear. We are against the principle of negotiations with the Zionist entity. From the very beginning, we knew that the process would lead to recognition, coexistence, and normalization between the Zionist entity and the ruling regimes in the Middle East. [passage omitted]

As to why the government rejected and insisted on confronting the protest march called for by Hizballah, the 10 Palestinian factions [opposed to the peace process], and the national and Islamic forces, we had warned the Lebanese people against the moves, intentions, and projects of this government. From our experience, we realized that the people in the government are not qualified for political administration on all levels. [passage omitted]

We have come to the conviction that the government is booby trapped with people who are in harmony with American and Israeli orientations. They are waiting for chances to place this country's fate and future at the disposal of the American and Zionist interests.

It can be said that the government's decision after the seven-day war to deploy the Lebanese Army in the operation area of the UN Interim Force in Lebanon falls within this framework. It was a response to the American-Israeli wishes of creating new major sedition in the country through a conflict between the Army and the resistance. But praise be to God, after intensive contacts with Syrian officials, and after a campaign of enlightenment and frank discussions with many officials in Lebanon, we managed to defuse and limit the danger resulting from the government decision. Now, after the signing of the Gaza-Jericho agreement, this government also insisted on signing, with blood, along with 'Arafat. [passage omitted]

[AL-'AHD] Can we say that the massacre was meant to drag Hizballah into internal battles?

[Al-Khalil] Surely, the government has made several attempts to prevent Hizballah from playing its pioneering role in confronting the Zionist enemy and to distract the party with internal wars. But we publicly said that we will not be dragged into internal wars. We will fight the promoters of major schemes; we will not fight the tools that implement these schemes or take political orders. We will fight the owners of the major schemes. We will fight the Zionists, we will fight occupation.

[AL-'AHD] The crime was a major one. What will your positions be? Will you go on until the end with the slogan of overthrowing the government?

[Al-Khalil] We are continuing, and we believe it is our legitimate right to continue. There is no justification for possible coexistence with the government. [passage omitted]

[AL-'AHD] What will Hizballah do if the Lebanese Government reaches a bilateral agreement with the enemy? How are you going to deal with such a serious development?

[Al-Khalil] No one can impose on our people in the region in general, and in Lebanon in particular, solutions and deals that have no link to the history, creed, and heritage of this nation. We are against the principle of recognizing the existence of something called "Israel." This is an alien body in the Arab and Islamic structure, a foreign object in the Middle East. The Jewish gathering in this region cannot form a homeland and become an integral part of this nation and its history. All attempts made to reverse this fact are doomed to failure. [passage omitted]

[AL-'AHD] During the signing of the agreement by 'Arafat and the Zionist enemy yesterday, the U.S. secretary of state said that Washington will stand strongly against those who oppose the settlement plan. What is your comment?

[Al-Khalil] The Americans are not revealing a secret here. The Americans are not waiting for signatures. They began their war a long time ago. They are waging war against all Islamic movements and all liberation movements in the Arab world. The Americans spared no effort in the past, and will spare no effort in the future. For their part, the Islamic movements, and the liberation movements in the Islamic world, will spare no effort in confronting this American threat and all suspect schemes.

If they can curb these movements they will do it. They will try in the future. We, with God's help, will work together with all liberation movements in the Arab and Islamic world. The struggle is permanent and continuous.

Buwayz, Delegation Leave for New York 23 Sep

NC2309120193 Beirut Voice of Lebanon in Arabic 1115 GMT 23 Sep 93

[Text] The Foreign Ministry delegation led by Foreign Minister Faris Buwayz left for the United Nations via Paris today. The delegation will join the prime minister when he arrives in New York.

EC Chairman Claes Arrives in Damascus for Talks

Makes Arrival Statement

JN2309080193 Damascus Syrian Arab Republic Radio Network in Arabic 0415 GMT 23 Sep 93

[Text] Damascus—Willy Claes, Belgian foreign minister and current EC chairman, arrived in Damascus at 0130 last night on a visit to Syria.

He was received at Damascus International Airport by Nasir Qaddur, minister of state for foreign affairs, a number of Foreign Ministry officials, the Belgian ambassador in Damascus, and the Embassy staff.

In a statement to SYRIAN ARAB NEWS AGENCY correspondent, Claes expressed his happiness with visiting Damascus and holding talks with the Syrian officials on the Middle East peace process. He said: I have come on behalf of the EC to listen to Syria's viewpoints and opinions about the peace process, and to explain the EC views in this regard.

Meets With al-Asad, al-Shar'

JN2309165293 Damascus Syrian Arab Republic Radio Network in Arabic 1515 GMT 23 Sep 93

[Text] At 1315 today, President Hafiz al-Asad received Belgian Foreign Minister Willy Claes, who is the current EC chairman, and his delegation. The meeting was attended by Foreign Minister Faruq al-Shar'. Talks centered on the Middle East peace process and the importance of its continuation to realize its goals.

Minister Claes expressed the EC's interest in the peace process and its appreciation of Syria's role in it. The president affirmed Syria's adherence to the peace process on the basis on which the Madrid conference was held. The president welcomed an effective European role to help the peace process reach its goals, namely, just and comprehensive peace.

Earlier today, a session of talks was held at the Foreign Ministry between the Syrian side led by Foreign Minister Faruq al-Shar' and the Belgian side led by Willy Claes, deputy prime minister and foreign minister, in his capacity as EC chairman. The talks were attended on the Syrian side by Yusuf Shakkur, the minister's assistant; Tahir Husami, director of the Organizations' Department; Miss Nabilah al-Sha'lan, head of the Information Department; and Ghassan Raslan, head of the Europe Department. On the Belgian side, the meeting was attended by the Belgian ambassador in Damascus, Michel Lastchenko; Ambassador Pierre Champinois, director of the European political cooperation secretariat, Rene Nescans, head of the Middle East and North Africa Department; Philip Bick, the minister's adviser; and Paul Malin, head of EC administration. [names and titles as heard]

During the talks, views were exchanged on the Palestinian-Israeli agreement, its ambiguities and loopholes, and the effect of all this on the coordination which had existed among the Arab sides participating in the peace process. The participants reviewed the results of the recent Arab League foreign ministers' meeting in Cairo.

Al-Shar' affirmed Syria's eagerness to continue the peace process to realize just and comprehensive peace on all fronts, based on Resolutions 242 and 338 and the land-for-peace principle.

For his part, EC Chairman Claes voiced the EC's conviction that Syria has a basic role in the peace process. The meeting also dealt with relations between the EC and Syria and the importance of their promotion.

The Belgian minister left Damascus at 1700 today. He was seen off by Foreign Minister Faruq al-Shar', a number of senior Foreign Minister officials, and the Belgian ambassador in Damascus and embassy staff.

Departs With 'Moderate Optimism'

JN2409065393 Damascus Syrian Arab Republic Radio Network in Arabic 1815 GMT 23 Sep 93

[Text] Willy Claes, the Belgian foreign minister and the current chairman of the European Community, left Damascus at 1700 today after a one-day visit to Syria. He was seen off at Damascus International Airport by Foreign Minister Faruq al-Shar', a number of senior Foreign Minister officials, and the Belgian ambassador in Damascus and embassy staff.

In a predeparture statement to journalists, Claes said: I came to Damascus, in particular, to acquaint myself with the Syrian view of the agreement between Israel and the PLO and to explain the way the EC can add momentum to the peace process. Claes added: We came here not to dictate ideas, but to see how can we effectively contribute to achieving peace. He said: I leave Damascus with a moderate amount of optimism. Syria, of course, believes in a comprehensive solution, and it does not believe that the agreement signed by the Israelis and the Palestinians will give momentum to the peace process. However, he added, Syria is ready to continue its efforts in accordance with what was agreed upon in the Madrid conference. Claes said that the EC is ready to exert efforts to invigorate the peace process.

Answering questions by the journalists accompanying the Belgian minister, Foreign Minister Faruq al-Shar' said: As Minister Claes said, in his capacity as the current chairman of the EC, he wanted to listen to the Syrian view. He met with President Hafiz al-Asad, who explained our position on the Palestinian-Israeli agreement, the gaps that exist in this agreement, and the conditions that surround the agreement. Al-Shar' added that the president also explained Syria's concern about the achievment of a just and comprehensive peace in the region and the effects of Israel's unilateral dealing with any Arab party to the peace process.

Al-Shar' added: We reaffirmed to Foreign Minister Claes Syria's concern for a just and comprehensive solution

based on the UN resolutions, international legitimacy, and the principles agreed upon within the Madrid formula. He said: We believe that the Israeli-Palestinian agreement will face many difficulties. Al-Shar' added: In light of the U.S., European, and international interest in giving a momentum to the peace process, in accordance with a comprehensive—not a unilateral—view, the difficulties facing the peace process now might be overcome. The foreign minister said that the time factor is important, adding that if it appears that Israel is trying to maneuver, believing that it has made an important achievement in its interest during this period—through the Palestinian-Israeli agreement—the peace process will retreat and the obstacles will increase with time.

Khaddam, Dissident Fatah Leader Discuss Accord

JN2209152493 Paris Radio Monte Carlo in Arabic 1200 GMT 22 Sep 93

[Text] In Damascus, Syrian Vice President 'Abd-al-Halim Khaddam today met with a delegation from the Fatah-the Uprising movement under Abu-Musa [Sa'id Musa Muragha]. The meeting is the third of its kind with a leader of the 10 Palestinian factions. Khaddam previously had received George Habash and Nayif Hawatimah.

The Syrian vice president reaffirmed his country's adherence to its principles regarding the Palestinian people's rights and Arab rights. The Palestinian delegation criticized the agreement between the PLO and the Hebrew state. It considers what 'Arafat did as not being representative of the Palestinian people and the PLO.

Iranian Request To Form 'Rejectionist Front' Denied

PM2309134593 London AL-SHARQ AL-AWSAT in Arabic 21 Sep 93 p 5

[Amir Tahiri report: "Syria Turns Down Iranian Request To Join New Rejectionist Front"]

[Text] London—Iranian diplomatic sources yesterday emphasized that Syria had turned down an Iranian request to abandon the peace process in the Middle East and join a new "rejectionist front."

The sources said that the Syrian rejection of the offer was expressed in two telephone conversations with Iranian President Hashemi-Rafsanjani. Hashemi-Rafsanjani had sent a written message to President al-Asad.

The Syrian Government has not commented on these reports so far.

It seems that Syria wants to keep its options open while continuing contacts with the United States and Egypt for an initiative concerning the occupied Golan Heights.

The diplomatic sources say that the [Syrian] president told Iranian Deputy Foreign Minister Hoseyn Sheykholeslam that Syria is determined to stay in the peace process launched in Madrid 30 October 1991.

The sources said that the Syrian president was "clearly" cool about the idea of setting up a new "rejectionist front" expected to include international pariahs like Iraq, Sudan, and Libya.

And it seems that the information about the Syrian president's carefully measured position was leaked by leadership elements in Tehran who fear Iran's implication in a situation it cannot control.

Despite the media clamor through which media services in Tehran have dealt with the question over the past three days, it seems that discussion of the role to be assigned to Iran has not yet been settled. The Iranian cabinet has not discussed the issue, nor have efforts been made to organize a huge demonstration against the [Palestinian-Israeli] agreement. And according to police reports, only 400 people joined the demonstration staged by some secondary school students, which had been called for by the wing loyal to Ahmad Khomeyni.

Small demonstrations were staged here and there in Qom and Mashhad.

The talks with a senior Japanese diplomat yesterday are further evidence that Iran has not yet decided to play the role of the rejectionist camp's leader.

U.S. Statement on Syrian Peace Commitment Reported

JN2409061193 Damascus Syrian Arab Republic Radio Network in Arabic 0415 GMT 24 sep 93

[Text] Washington—The U.S. State Department last night announced that Syria is committed to achieving progress in the peace talks and to working closely with the United States.

This emerged in a statement by the U.S. State Department issued after a meeting between Egyptian Foreign Minister 'Amr Musa and U.S. Secretary of State Warren Christopher in Washington.

Press on Country's 'Firm' Position on Peace

JN1709075793 Damascus Syrian Arab Republic Radio Network in Arabic 0445 GMT 17 Sep 93

[From the press review]

[Text] Our newspapers' commentaries and political analyses today dealt with Syria's commitment to the peace process and its firm, principled, and positive position based on the resolutions of international legitimacy and the refusal to relinquish any iota of land or rights—a position that has gained world respect and appreciation.

An AL-BA'TH commentary today deals with Syria's primary role in the peace process. AL-BA'TH says: Syria has informed the world, through President Hafiz al-Asad, that it seeks peace and security in the region and in the world. The paper adds that the peace sought by Syria will restore rights to their owners and provide security

for everybody, reaffirming that, under no condition, will Syria accept Israel's concept of peace—in which Israel acquires both land and peace.

AL-BA'TH notes that Syria is committed to Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338 and that the party obstructing their implementation is the one that rejects peace. The paper notes that the Rabin government is challenging the United Nations and its resolutions. The paper says: If Rabin believes that Syria's adherence to its rights will obstruct peace, then he should know that Syria will not relinquish an iota of national or pan-Arab soil.

Concluding, AL-BA'TH says: We seek a just and comprehensive peace that restores our complete rights and saves the region from tension and aggression.

Under the headline "Comprehensive Peace Achieved Through Comprehensive Withdrawal," AL-THAWRAH says: When the peace process was first launched, Syria spelled out its stand on the process on the basis of its constants. Those constants are represented by refusal to relinquish a single inch of occupied territory and by adhering to the peace process as a method for establishing a just and comprehensive peace, based on the full implementation of the resolutions of international legitimacy and the land for peace principle.

The paper notes that President Hafiz al-Asad reiterated these stands in the telephone call he received from U.S. President Bill Clinton. He reaffirmed Syria's continued commitment to the peace process, its concern for achieving a just and comprehensive peace in the Middle East, and its readiness to cooperate to achieve this goal.

AL-THAWRAH stresses that the Syrian stand and its constants, stemming from the principles and resolutions of international legitimacy, have received the respect and appreciation of the world. This is because the Syrian stand has defined the clear path for genuine peace in the world, constituted the key to the peace process, and provided opportunities for progress each time Israel tried to obstruct the peace process.

AL-THAWRAH adds: Syria commits itself to the peace process in accordance with the principles of international legitimacy and announces its continued readiness to cooperate on the basis of the rules of this process. Syria believes that this process is a method to achieve a just and comprehensive peace to restore the occupied territory to its Arab owners and to guarantee the national legitimate rights of the Palestinian people. The paper notes that Syria participated in the peace process, continuously committed itself to it, and was concerned for its continuation due to the fact that the final objective is the establishment of a comprehensive peace in exchange for a comprehensive Israeli withdrawal. Therefore, Syria has always responded to this process, adhered to its principles, and honestly worked for its professed objective.

Concluding, AL-THAWRAH says that Syria, which has remained faithful to its stand and its objective, will not abandon this stand. It will continue to be faithful to all the bases and principles of this stand. It will prove its faithfulness through adherence to the rules of justice, through faithfulness to a comprehensive solution, and through determination to regain the occupied territories and usurped rights. Syria refuses to relinquish any part of any national and pan-Arab right, no matter how small it is. Syria will not accept less than full withdrawal for a comprehensive peace.

In another commentary, AL-THAWRAH notes that no partial solution can guarantee the future of peace in the region. AL-THAWRAH says: The one who is concerned about the future should work for a just and comprehensive peace that restores lands and rights to their owners. The paper adds that the first fact in the peace process is that Israel has done the impossible by turning the desired peace from a just and comprehensive peace into an incomplete and divided peace to suit its policy—not just in terms of expansion, but also in terms of dictating the conditions of Israeli peace on Arab territory.

Kuwaiti Fund To Finance Damascus Power Plant

JN2109184593 Damascus Syrian Arab Television Network in Arabic 1730 GMT 21 Sep 93

[Text] At the State Planning Authority today, a loan agreement was signed between the Syrian Arab Republic's Government and the Kuwait Arab Economic Development Fund [KAEDF]. The money will finance the al-Nasiriyah power generating station in northeastern Damascus.

The agreement was signed for Syria by Dr. 'Abd-al-Rahim al-Subay'i, state minister for planning, and for the fund by its director general, Mr. Badr al-Humaydi. The signing was attended by officials of the Ministries of Planning and Electricity, and the Kuwaiti ambassador and the Kuwaiti Embassy staff in Damascus.

Al-Subay'i and al-Humaydi gave speeches on the occasion, lauding ever developing ties between the two brotherly states, as directed by President Hafiz al-Asad and the Amir of Kuwait, Shaykh Jabir al-Ahmad al-Sabah.

The 40-million Kuwaiti dinar loan will finance the purchase and installation of three gas turbines of a 100-megawatt capacity each and auxiliary equipment. The plant will be on line by early March, 1994.

Afghanistan

Rabbani Discusses Refugees With UN Commissioner

LD2109162593 Kabul Radio Afghanistan Network in Pashto 1530 GMT 21 Sep 93

[Excerpts] The president of the Islamic State of Afghanistan, the esteemed Professor Borhanoddin Rabbani, today received the UN High Commissioner for Refugees, Mrs. Ogata, who, heading a high-ranking delegation, arrived in Kabul today. At the meeting, the UN commissioner presented information concerning UN measures regarding the return of Afghan refugees. Afghan refugees in Pakistan and Iran are keen to return home. [passage omitted]

In reply, esteemed Professor Borhanoddin Rabbani thanked the United Nations for its assistance with refugees during the years of jihad. He emphasized that our country is in need of immediate international assistance for the return of Afghan refugees. The esteemed president added that the return of refugees to the country, the reconstruction of Afghanistan, the participation of the refugees in economic affairs, and the provision of suitable working and living conditions are among the important issues that should be considered priorities with regard to UN and international assistance.

Mrs. Ogata said that the United Nations will ask for greater international assistance from the peace-loving countries of the world and utilize it for the reconstruction of Afghanistan and aiding the return of Afghan refugees.

India

Ministry Extends 'Full Support' to Yeltsin

BK2309164093 Delhi Doordarshan Television Network in English 1615 GMT 23 Sep 93

[Text] India has extended full support to the Russian president, Mr. Boris Yeltsin, and hoped that he along with other democratic leaders would succeed in resolving the existing differences in a peaceful environment. In a statement, the spokesman of the Ministry of External Affairs said today that New Delhi is aware of President Yeltsin's role in guiding Russia in its transition to a pluralistic democracy and markey economy.

The spokesman said that the Indian Government has also taken note of the significant development which follows the decree issued by the Russian president on Tuesday [21 September]. The spokesman added that while these developments are essentially internal, they do tend to affect international relations and the positive orientation towards pluralistic democracies in the world.

Rao Rules Out Third-Party Mediation on Kashmir

BK2309150293 Delhi All India Radio Network in English 1430 GMT 23 Sep 93

[Text] The prime minister has categorically rejected any third party mediation on the Kashmir issue. He said it has to be resolved bilaterally within the framework of the Simla agreement. He was talking to newsmen on board the aircraft while returning to New Delhi from Tehran last night. Mr. Rao said India-Pakistan relations could be exemplary for the whole world if irritants like Islamabad's continued support to terrorism in Kashmir are removed. He said the scope of the two neighbors coming together and working jointly in all international forums is enormous. Constant and purposeful dialogue between the two sides will definitely yield some results. What is needed is sincerity of purpose, he said.

Terming his visit as satisfying, Mr. Rao said it gave the Iranian leaders an opportunity to have a better perception of New Delhi's stand on various issues. He said the spiritual leader, Ayatollah Khamene'i, and the Iranian president, Mr. Hashemi-Rafsanjani, told him in clear terms that Kashmir is an internal problem of India and Tehran has no intention to interfere.

Article Assesses Rao's Visit to China

BK2109112793 Delhi THE HINDUSTAN TIMES in English 14 Sep 93 p 13

[Article by A.P. Venkateswaran]

[Text] China and India are the two largest countries in terms of their population. Accordingly, friendship and cooperation between them can be a great force for peace and development. That was why Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru made it a major plank of India's foreign policy to strengthen relations with China and gone out of the way to befriend the People's Republic of China when it emerged on the international scene in 1949.

Unfortunately, as subsequent events proved, the Chinese had not seen things the same way. The sense of shock and dismay which followed, as a result of Chinese incursions across the border, the building of a road through Aksai Chin, considered by us as Indian territory, and the war on the Himalayas in 1962 could, perhaps have been avoided if Nehru had been less of a visionary and more inclined towards real politik.

The first sign of things to come was the Chinese military occupation of Tibet in 1950. When India gently remonstrated, at that time, pointing out the problems this caused for peace and stability in the region, the response of Beijing was rude and peremptory in the extreme. Even then, the Indian representative in Lhasa had sent a telegram to New Delhi, highlighting the dangers posed by the presence of Chinese power right on the border of India, in these words: "The Chinese have entered Tibet; the Himalayas have ceased to exist". This advice was disregarded and he was informed that the Foreign Office possessed the full picture, whereas he saw things from

Lhasa. Subsequent events were to prove the correctness of the saying: "Those who do not learn from history are condemned to re-live it."

It is against this background that the visit of Prime Minister P. V. Narasimha Rao to China needs to be assessed. One outcome of the visit touted as a landmark in Sino-Indian relations, was the signing of an Agreement providing for both sides to "maintain peace and tranquility along the Line of Actual Control (LAC)". While on the face of it the claim may appear justified, a calm appraisal would seem to be necessary coming as the agreement does 12 years after the commencement of periodic bilateral talks in 1981. For one thing, the Chinese have in the past put forward no less than three different Lines in Actual Control. None of them has been clearly defined on a map, or demarcated on the ground. This situation still prevails. Accordingly, to speak of a Line of Actual Control, as if it is known to both sides, is to stretch one's credibility. Of course, the agreement provides that where there is doubt, joint teams of military personnel and surveyors would be called in to resolve the problem. But this again presumes that doubts will arise only on certain specified points.

It should be noted that the formulation, "both sides will maintain peace and tranquillity along the Line of Actual Control", was first worked out at the third round of senior officials level talks between the two sides in 1983. This was not formalised by any signed agreement, precisely because the Chinese had not been prepared to spell out on a map what they considered to be their Line of Actual Control. The maximum they were prepared to say was that this Line was "well-known" to the Indian side.

In actual fact, while each side has been aware of the border claim of the other side, neither is in a position to say anything precisely as to where exactly the LAC runs. In most places in the Eastern Sector, where the Chinese accept the McMahon Line as the LAC our forces are at a considerable distance to the South of it. So too, in the Western Sector, we are far removed from Chinese claim line up to which their forces have occupied. It would therefore be absurd to suggest that the LAC will merely connect points where Indian forces are present, and be taken as a Line connecting these posts. Nor, that the LAC represents the present patrolling limits of our forces.

As for mutual withdrawals by the forces on the two sides, which has also been mentioned, to prevent the possibility of inadvertent clashes, assuming that this can be worked out in practice, the advantage would clearly be with the Chinese due to the nature of the terrain in the area, which is mountainous and extremely difficult on the Indian side, whereas it is a smooth table-land on the Chinese side.

There are many valid reasons why India and China should get closer to each other in today's world, apart from settling existing thorny bilateral issues, such as differences over the border. In the post-cold-war situation, both countries need to make common cause against outside pressures seeking to impose on them unfair conditionalities on issues like transfer of technology, foreign trade and human rights. The removal of past tensions between them will prevent the possibility of others fishing in troubled waters, by playing one against the other.

More importantly, the two countries could then embark upon cooperative programmes relating to the environment, beneficial use of the resources of the Himalayas, and providing the basis for durable peace and security in the region.

Good fences may make good neighbours, but this is not necessarily an infallible proposition unless there is mutual trust and a fund of goodwill to keep the agreed borders friendly and peaceful. It is a long-term process and will take time to consolidate. Meanwhile, it would be wise not to overlook what happened in February 1979 when China did not hesitate to cross the recognised international boundary into Vietnam to "teach a lesson" to that country, in Deng Xiaoping's own words. The need to keep our defences strong will remain a constant, accordingly, irrespective of any improvement in Sino-Indian relations.

The decade of the 1990s promises to be full of uncertainties until such time as a more stable global political equilibrium is established. A major factor of this uncertainty is linked with what will happen in China as and when its supreme leader, Deng Xiaoping, leaves the scene. For the past few years, and particularly after the suppression of the Tiananmen uprising of June 1989, a succession struggle has been developing in Beijing. The Chinese leadership is well aware, at all levels, that China is now the last bastion of Communism. In the eyes of the U.S., therefore, that "evil empire" too, needs to be dismantled.

Just as Indians tend to be fissiparous, the Chinese tend to be factional. There are a number of factions within the leadership in Beijing, which differ from the present course of action and would prefer a return to a more rigidly controlled system of government. While the Chinese economy has done spectacularly well in the Special Economic Zones (SEZ) set up during the last 15 years under the dispensation of Deng, the vast hinterland has remained almost untouched. This is a cause for concern.

It has become customary for Chinese leaders when they visit New Delhi, and Indian leaders visiting Beijing, to speak of a "new era" in India-China relations brought about by Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi going to China in 1988. But nothing tangible has really changed in regard to the central issue between the two countries, namely the resolution of the border problem, without which a full normalisation of bilateral relations will not be possible.

It should also be understood clearly in the same context that China remains ambivalent to date on Kashmir and indeed has benefited to the extent of about 2,000 square miles of Kashmiri territory illegally ceded to it by

Pakistan in an agreement with China concerning the border of Pakistan Occupied Kashmir (PoK).

Although China has declared that a final settlement will be made with whichever party gains control over the area when Pakistan and India reach an agreement on the overall issue of Kashmir, this acquisition of Kashmiri territory by China cannot be overlooked. China also has not accepted Sikkim's accession to the Indian Union, and condemned its so-called "annexation" by India. The reiteration by India that Tibet is an integral part of China as happened during Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi's visit to Beijing in 1988 and again during Premier Li Peng's visit to New Delhi in 1991 would, in this context, appear to be gratuitous.

To end on a positive note, one cannot do better than to repeat the Chinese exhortation: "Remember the past while building for the future!"

Border Accord Hailed

BK2309154793 Delhi THE HINDUSTAN TIMES in English 13 Sep 93 p 13

[By Mira Sinha Bhattacharjea]

[Text] There are two ways of reading the agreement that was signed in Beijing on September 7. One, as a clever exercise in diplomatic cosmetics which has attractively packaged decisions taken since 1981 on maintaining peace and tranquility on the border, to present them to the Indian public as an 'epoch-making agreement'. The credit for this would accrue to a weak Prime Minister in urgent need of improving his image at home and abroad.

Or, it can be regarded as a truly 'landmark' agreement, the political significance of which outstrips the arithmetical sum of its nine brief articles. As such, the agreement must be read to imply that a major step has been taken to arrive at a mutually agreed formula for ending a long and hauntingly bitter past.

As a package of confidence building measures [CBMs], some old, some new, intended to stabilise the military situation along the border and prevent any recurrence of the kind of incidents that almost brought the two countries to war in 1986-87, the agreement is of course, to be welcomed. It formalises CBMs that had been rumoured earlier.

But the real import of this agreement, and that which would make it deserving of the adjective that has been attached to it, lies in these and other references to a Line of Actual Control [LAC]. This appears to be an attempt to bridge the wide gulf that has existed between the rival territorial claims that were put forward and the negotiating positions that were adopted by the two sides, a long, long thirty-four years ago. It appears to do so by substituting the motion of a Line of Actual Control—both as concept and reality for the painful and fruitless past exercises in finding agreed principles that would govern their common approach to a resolution of the territorial issue. If the official level talks of 1960 were concerned with arriving at agreement on just basic facts concerning the border such as historical data or the exact coordinates of a particular place, the secretary level talks that began in 1981 attempted to define shared principles, resulting in a comic opera situation where if China proposed five "broad" principles, India would counter with a set of six 'working' principles and so on. Meanwhile, India studiously ignored the Deng package deal of 1980. Like the Zhou Enlai proposal of 1960 it suggested a resolution of the boundary problem on the basis of historical, administrative and ground realities. It called for a trade off between large claims to territory controlled by the other, and of vital interest to it, which were not conceivably realisable and, therefore, could not be more than notional. Zhou also proposed an acceptance of the mediatory role played by history whereby "an actual line of control between the two sides has taken place on the Chinese side of the boundary" in the eastern sector—a Chinese euphemism for the McMahon Line alignment. India also refrained from putting forward a counter package proposal, and refused to give legitimacy to the Chinese concept of a Line of Actual Control. But, by 1984, it was quite clear that talks with China, at whatever level, would be unproductive without a change of strategy which alone could provide an agreed basis for discussion, supported by a forward presence in the eastern sector, upto the McMahon Line alignment was creatively interpreted to include those areas that India considers as being vital to its defence and security needs [sentence as published].

What happened thereafter is a long but shadowed saga that encompasses the swiftly changing direction and framework of international politics in the early years of the 1980s; the profound change in Soviet strategic perspectives after Gorbachev came to power; the ensuing rapid improvement of Sino-Soviet relations; and the parallel demotion of the special relationship with India.

By the mid-1980s Indian negotiating strategy had begun to change. It no longer held that full normalisation would have to await the prior resolution of the border question; the two processes could run in tandem. It is in this background of events that the border in the eastern Sector became live almost a full quarter century after the war of 1962. Operation Chequerboard which India denied had ever taken place, carried Indian military presence up to and where necessary beyond the map drawn McMahon Line, to reach the high crest line. It also ensured a quantum increase in ground and air-defence capability in the entire region bordering the McMahon Line. If 1962 brought into being a new and objective line of control in the western sector that more than satisfied China's real interests, the events of 1985-87 apparently did the same for India in the eastern sector despite the inherent risk of a major military confrontation with China. This is, of course, conjecture details and data pertaining to the events of 1985-87 have not yet been made available. But, as a close study of the data

that is available reveals, India used that occasion to overtly probe the Chinese meaning and alignment of a Line of Actual Control.

The new central question raised thereafter was: what should be the alignment of an LAC acceptable to both sides? India's preferred alignment was the altered line in the eastern sector with the post-1962 line in the western sector remaining, as far as can be presumed, undisturbed. If this analysis is not way out, then India it would seem has successfully turned the tables on China utilising the essential pragmatism of its approach without the other frills. However, new problems were also raised. One was how to dilute the first irate reaction of Beijing to these developments. In early 1988 the Chinese Ambassador to New Delhi had stated publicly that there were now two sets of problems in the east, one old, one new. The old was still a 'legacy of history', for which the Deng package was still on offer. The new was dual: there was the threat of renewed border clashes given the post-1987 eyeball to eyeball military situation in the east; and there was the altered line of control in that area, for which the Deng package was no longer on offer.

Sometime in 1988, the forward process of normalisation was resumed and led to the Rajiv Gandhi visit to China, the restatement of the Indian position on Tibet and the setting up of the Joint Working Group, presumably under new mandate, which from this perspective, was to agree on CBMs and so freeze the military positions of the two sides, and to persuade the Chinese to accept the Indian version of an LAC. It is presumably the outcome of these efforts that is now reflected in the recent agreement. Both sides have moved a long way away from their earlier stated positions. India no longer harps on the legality of the McMahon Line and seems to be willing to consider the border as a whole, and to apply the same approach to the sectors of dispute in the east and the west. China on its part has not aired the existence of a traditional customary line or mentioned the need for a trade off, or attempted to alter the new LAC by military means.

However, as the very careful wording of the present agreement reveals, grave differences still exist and there is a long haul ahead before these will be ironed out. These differences are indicated in many ways. One, in the very wording of the formulation which calls for the maintenance of peace and tranquility 'along the Line of Actual Control in the India-China border areas.' It does not require any extraordinary insight to notice the contradiction inherent between the precision of alignment implied by the phrase 'Line of Actual Control' (the Indian contribution), and the vagueness conveyed by the phrase (presumably added by China) "in the India-China border areas". An equally careful reading of the text of the agreement reveals that this distinction has been retained right through. Thus, for instance, the CBMs including the phased reduction of military forces consistent with the principle of 'mutual and equal security', apply only to the LAC and not to their force levels in the 'border areas' for which the formulation is quite different.

It is perhaps in recognition of these continuing differences that the agreement provides for the establishment of yet another group to monitor the implementation of the CBMs (the Chinese priority) as well as to resolve differences relating to the alignment of the LAC (the Indian priority).

As such the agreement is neither an unambiguous agreement nor can it lead to an early resolution of the border problem. Instead it states the position and priorities of both sides. It is nevertheless, at least on the Indian side, a major and realistic effort to move away from the futility of the past earlier approaches to the territorial issue, towards more flexible ones, providing as always, that the opposition parties are drawn into the process and the public is educated about these efforts and their implications.

Commentary Lauds Outcome of Rao's Iran Visit

BK2309134093 Delhi All India Radio General Overseas Service in English 1010 GMT 23 Sep 93

[Commentary by Om Prakash, ASSAM TRIBUNE special correspondent]

[Text] In the words of Mr. P.V. Narasimha Rao, his three-day visit to Iran has been most fruitful, satisfying, and his talks with the Iranian leaders were cordial and purposeful. In the words of President Hashemi-Rafsanjani himself, Mr. Rao's visit was a turning point and that he was looking for better and closer relations between the two countries. The summit level talks between the Indian prime minister and the Iranian president did clear many irritants that had been dogging both the countries. To recall, there had been occasions for heartburn when Iran as member of the Islamic Conference Organization had echoed the familiar Pakistani Islamic sentiment of human rights violations in Kashmir. Mr. Rao's visit, the first by an Indian prime minister in 18 years, has helped douse such exaggerated fears and misapprehensions that had been stalked to absurd heights by Pakistani propaganda.

The decision of India and Iran to collaborate in the economic development of the Central Asian states to promote bilateral trade and cooperation and forging of closer ties in the field of science and technology is no mean achievement. The two memorandums of understanding to this effect are hallmark in improving the quality of life of the people of the two countries. The three-day visit of Mr. Rao has helped in establishing closer rapport with the Iranian leadership that will blossom in the years to come. The memorandum on transport and transit facilities will have far-reaching implications for trade and economic cooperation not only between India and Iran, but also with Central Asian republics which are threatened with political instability at the hand of fundamentalist forces due to [word indistinct] economic development and lack of resources. A technical study team in last July had recommended transit through Bander-e 'Abbas port of Iran. The port is approachable to Turkmenistan through road and

rail link is under construction [sentence as heard]. The cooperation in science and technology covers (?establishing) science and engineering institutes and universities, setting up of research centers in fundamental and applied sciences, cooperation in metallurgy, oil and petrochemicals, biotechnology, electronics, computers, communications, and energy. One of the most important items of Mr. Rao's agenda was gas pipeline project for which both the sides showed keen interest. Iran has large number of gas deposits which may last for more than 300 years.

Mr. Rao's visit has been a great milestone in both political, economic, and international cooperation on issues like terrorism. India has not only won a qualified endorsement from the Iranian leadership to India's stand on Kashmir and the state of minorities in India, but also put India on the center stage in Central Asia. On Kashmir, President 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani gave clear assurance that Iran has no desire to interfere in India's internal affairs. A forthright rejection of a third party mediation was also [word indistinct] by Mr. Narasimha Rao. Iran was also told in more than clear terms that India would not allow Pakistan to continue to erode India's territorial integrity. The Indian prime minister also decried the excessive concern shown by third countries about Muslims in India as they were confident and fashioning their own destiny within the secular democratic system of India. All the world's great faiths were reflected in the composition of India's population and Indian democracy was nondiscriminatory and equally respectful to all religious faiths. India has successfully managed its plurality. President Hashemi-Rafsanjani showed his understanding and objectivity when he said the Indian experiment in managing plurality of society had proved successful. Iran gave clear signals that it desires to put relations between the two countries in a significant framework.

Condemnation of cross-border terrorism is another significant success of Mr. Rao's diplomacy. A look back to history shows Iran had suffered most from terrorism, especially in 1980's, when the bomb blasts took the lives of a score of Iranian top leaders. The kind of welcome given to the Indian prime minister and the cordiality in which the greater economic, technical, and cultural interaction took place only reflected the sunshine in the relationship between the two countries.

Iran

PLO-Israel Accord Deemed 'Cosmetic' Change

NC2409112393

[Editorial Report] Tehran English newspapers give extensive coverage to the PLO-Israel accord and to statements by Iranian Government sources on the subject. The following are representative of editorial comment from these papers:

Tehran KAYHAN INTERNATIONAL in English on 14 September carries an editorial entitled: "Jericho-Gaza: Prelude to Greater Palestinian Problems" with vehement criticism of the accord:

"A false whiff of dramatic change blew over the Middle East this week heralding cosmetic changes in the political and economic trends of the region. Don't think that the fierce and relentless struggle that has been going on for 45 years has come to an end and that the dawn of a new era in the Middle East has begun. What happened is that the PLO and not the Israeli army will now be in charge of putting down the intifadah."

"The Palestine Liberation Organization, long considered a 'terrorist' group in Israel, but now irreversibly prostituted, may even move its headquarters from Tunis to the West Bank town of Jericho before Christmas."

"With the mutual recognition documents being signed between the PLO and Israel now a closed chapter, what will be witnessed in the Gaza Strip will be an upsurge of inter-Palestinian violence—Islamists versus the PLO—that will give the Zionist state plenty of diplomatic and media ammunition to demonstrate to the world why they cannot ever allow a fully restored Palestine. This will resemble the Zulu-ANC wars of South Africa."

The paper carries grim forebodings: "One has to bear in mind that the struggle in Palestine was and still is today a Muslim world versus Israeli conflict, with the Palestinian side being the focus of attention. Therefore, unless and until an agreement restoring Palestine to its real proprietors is reached, this latest gesture will be hailed as a victory for world peace, whereas in reality it is the start of a future war to be fought between Palestinians. In other words, the Zionist regime will be able to relax and enjoy the scene where none of its soldiers will have to risk their lives."

The daily continues: "It should also be borne in mind that this accord has weakened all the Arab negotiators, namely the Syrians and the Lebanese. The Syrian and Lebanese negotiators are now left alone to face strong U.S. pressure. Pan-Arabism will fail miserably in this new environment. There is a mixed reaction of bitterness and acceptance, outright rejection and even death threats against the Palestinian leader from progressive guerrillas, who rightly consider the accord as unadulterated treason. Israel's right wing and Palestinian militants have both pledged to foil the accord."

The paper concludes on an ominous note: "Nobody can say if the PLO really has the means to apply the accord, despite 'Arafat's assurances. What is sure is that the reign of King Yasir will soon come to an ignoble end."

Tehran KAYHAN INTERNATIONAL in English in its 16 September editorial entitled: "Marriage of (In)convenience" castigates the accord once again, this time directing most of its remarks toward Yasir 'Arafat: "For almost all Middle East watchers it is easy to understand why Chairman Yasir 'Arafat, scorned and dumped by his former 'Arab brothers,' turned to his deadliest enemies—the Zionist regime and the U.S."

"Now that the White House gala is over, with General Yitzhaq Rabin and Abu-'Ammar [Yasir 'Arafat's] holding in their hands a 'historical accord,' the question is how, and by whom will the agreement be implemented? The nearly seven-year-old intifadah has established without any element of doubt that Mr. 'Arafat is economically broke and politically bankrupt. In the occupied territories his popularity was and is fading at terrific speed."

The daily continues in this vein: "In a not unnatural setup this week's Israel-PLO understanding is a marriage of convenience which is bound to produce some inconvenience for its architects. Few people realistically expect peace will break out over the Gaza Strip and in and around the West Bank just because Messrs Clinton, Rabin and 'Arafat want it, not to mention the infatuation of the rich pro- Western Arab governments to forge some sort of compromise with the Qods [Jerusalem] occupying regime.

The paper then asks whether "the unprecedented growth of Islamic tendencies" and the "resurgence of Islam" can be reversed "from Morocco to the Mindanao Islands."

In conclusion, the paper states: "If what happened in the White House on Monday and watched by millions of TV viewers can be called 'peace,' then all should be clearly aware that it is an imposed peace between Israel and Mr. 'Arafat's PLO and not between the people of Israel and Palestinian masses. The international community will, once the excitement is over, save itself a lot of trouble if it realizes that Chairman 'Arafat does not speak for all of the PLO let alone the Palestinian masses. Such haphazard accords and temptations have not and will not lead to peace and security for Israel—a commitment the U.S. says it will steadfastly work for."

Tehran TEHRAN TIMES in English on 14 September carries comment in its editorial: "Diplomacy of a Crisis" which traces the history of the "liberation-seeking struggles of the Palestinians" and the "intifadah." The daily writes: "As their diplomacy is to continue the fighting, though in a different way, Israel and its backers, especially America, essayed to drag the Palestinians to the negotiation table."

"They conspired to politically assassinate the Palestine Liberation Organization, an organization set up with the aim of liberating Palestine. To this end, Israel treated the PLO so contemptuously that a clear prospect for the PLO among the Palestinian masses is not foreseeable. The pact does not make any mention of the right of the Palestinians to manifest destiny. In fact, the pact gives a limited autonomy which may at any time be violated by the Israeli regime."

The paper then adds: "What Israel should know is that although the PLO is the most influential Palestinian organization, it is not the only one. So the PLO's decision does not mean confirmation by the Palestinian nation."

The paper ends thus: "There are scores of Palestinian organizations which represent the feelings and desires of the liberation-seeking people of Palestine. They will continue to battle against Israel to repel Israeli aggression and liberate their occupied land."

Arabic Beam Highlights Opposition to Accord

NC2309160893

[Editorial Report] Tehran Voice of the Islamic Republic of Iran in Arabic 1630 GMT newscasts from 13 through 22 September have been observed to highlight opposition to the Israeli-PLO agreement in various Arab countries, particularly Syria and Lebanon, as well as in the West Bank and Gaza.

On 13 September, the day the agreement was signed in Washington, the radio included in its 1630 GMT cast as its fifth item a four-minute report on clashes between Palestinians and Israeli forces in the occupied territories over the signing of the "ill-omened" agreement in Washington. The radio also noted demonstrations and protests staged by Palestinians in Lebanon and Syria against the signing of the PLO-Israel agreement. It said: "Lebanese police began patrolling Beirut and other major towns this morning to prevent the staging of demonstrations hostile to the peace agreement between the PLO and Zionist entity." Other demonstrations were reportedly staged in al-Yarmuk, a Palestinian camp near Damascus, in protest against the agreement; the demonstrators "burned the Zionist flag and 'Arafat posters."

On 14 September, the station began its newscast with a two-minute report on remarks made by President Hashemi-Rafsanjani in which he referred to the agreement between the PLO and Israel as "a treacherous step." The radio then carried a two-minute recorded dispatch from its Beirut correspondent on Lebanese resistance attacks against Israelis and their agents, noting: "A Hizballah source said that the resistance attacks are in response to the signing of the treasonous deal between 'Arafat and Rabin." The radio also carried a seven-minute report highlighting demonstrations in the West Bank in protest against the "'Arafat-Tel Aviv treasonous and capitulationist agreement." The report also cited the former Palestine National Council speaker, who had resigned his post in protest against the signing of peace accord, as saying that the agreement was "illegal" and that 'Arafat could not change the Palestinian national charter. The newscast concluded with a commentary noting that "the accord aims to force the PLO to suppress the intifadah."

On 15 September, the radio carried a three-minute recorded dispatch by its Beirut correspondent on the escalation of Palestinian attacks against occupation forces as an expression of rejection and indignation against the signing of the accord. The correspondent cites press statements by Hamas representatives in the occupied territories and Jordan as saying: "Hamas fighters will not hesitate to strike at any Zionist military target in Gaza and Jericho after the Palestinian self-rule authority is established." A five-minute commentary at

the end of the newscast describes and assails Israeli Prime Minister Rabin's visit to Morocco, saying Israel and Morocco could establish diplomatic relations and other Arab states might follow suit. It also claims the Arab and Islamic world is under an "onslaught" led by the United States and "world Zionism," adding: "The Islamic revolutionary forces must confront this."

On 16 September, the radio carries as the second item on its 1630 GMT newscast a one-minute report on a statement by Nateq-Nuri that notes: "Islamic Majles Speaker Nateq-Nuri has described the signing of the treasonous 'Arafatist-Zionist agreement as a mark of disgrace. He said that the agreement is a big satanic act [amal shaytani kabir], a spawn of the new world order." The third item on the same cast is a half-minute report on a "protest demonstration" by Palestinians in a West Bank village. The fifth item in the cast is a two-minute report rounding up opposition to the agreement as follows: The Lebanese Higher Islamic Shiite Council describes the agreement as "a grave danger" for the Palestinian people; a statement by the Damascus-based Arab Workers Federation describes the agreement as "treasonous"; a statement by the Palestinian Artists Syndicate in Damascus also denounces that accord. A seven-minute station commentary at the end of the cast assails the signing of the Jordan-Israeli agenda agreement.

From 17 September to date the radio has continued to carry reports and commentaries assailing the Palestinian-Israeli agreement and signalling opposition to it. Following are the slugs on the topic as listed in program summaries for the past six days: 17 Sep—"Lebanese paper said Arab-Israeli accords will not end war. Palestinian students issued statement calling for abolishing accord with Israel. The DFLP leader said 'Arafat is Israel's policeman. Shaykh Sa'id Sha'ban said the PLO-Israeli accord is betrayal." 18 Sep—"Hamas supporters in Gaza demonstrated in protest against Gaza-Jericho." The station commentary touched on U.S. and European efforts to overcome opposition to the PLO-Israel agreement. 19 Sep—"The Majles speaker has denounced the Israeli-PLO agreement." 20 Sep—"The intifadah command has issued a statement criticizing 'Arafat for signing the agreement." The commentary was on the visits by Rabin and 'Arafat to Cairo; these two plus Mubarak were said to be attempting to push the Arabs into reconciliation with the Zionists; the commentary says that there is Islamic unity in rejecting that betrayal. 21 Sep—"The Majles speaker stressed Islamic unity and reiterated rejection of the PLO-Israel agreement. Syria's al-Asad criticized the Israeli-PLO accord in a statement to AL-AKHBAR." 22 Sep—"Many religious and political figures took part in meetings in Beirut to denounce the PLO-Israeli accord."

Jannati on 'Treachery' of Gaza-Jericho Accord

LD0309181793

[Editorial Report] Tehran Voice of the Islamic Republic of Iran First Program Network in Persian at 1048 GMT on 3 September carries a recording of the second sermon delivered at Friday prayers in Tehran by Ayatollah Ahmad Jannati, member of the Guardian Council. A Tehran radio report on the sermon was published on page 37 of the 3 September Near East & South Asia DAILY REPORT.

In addition to the points highlighted in the Tehran radio report, Jannati says the following in the recording of the sermon:

"Why should we neglect the plight of Muslims today? I am concerned that silent individuals, silent governments, and some silent people in Islamic societies—in the face of so much tyranny—might be engulfed tomorrow by the same scourge or maybe by something even worse, God forbid. We are witnessing what they are doing to Muslims now. On the one hand, the West has sat in Bosnia-Herzegovina and is planning to reward the Serbs, who perpetrated so many atrocities—killed so many innocent people, and annihilated so many children, old men and women, the sick, and the disabled. The West says to the Serbs: Welcome, take half of the country as a reward. On the one hand, they do this, and it is not clear what the Muslims can achieve by pleading and flouncing. On the other hand, Israel has come forward and wishes to trample on the blood of so many Palestinian martyrs. Israel sits around the same table with those who claimed to be supporters of the Palestinian oppressed and homeless. It is surprising that they are so happy and are rushing to be recognized by Israel. The problem until now was the fact that no one was prepared to recognize Israel. Now they are pleading with Israel to recognize them.

"Later they plan to sign an agreement to place the Gaza Strip and Jericho at their disposal. The consequences of this treachery and the misery and misfortunes it would create would become apparent if, God forbid, this were to be realized. In any event, what is clear is the fact that they wish to trample upon intifadah—the blood of the martyrs—and to cover up all the crimes committed by Israel in the past 30 to 40 years.

"They are also massacring Muslims in the Armenia-Azerbaijan conflict and are forcing them to flee their homes. One hears tragic news every time one switches on the radio: the shelling of residential areas, forcing the people to leave their ancestral land, and many other problems they create for Muslims. The countries that wish to receive these homeless war refugees will also face difficulties. Any country wishing to accept refugees will have to endure many difficulties.

"The Muslims in Somalia and Kashmir are also facing problems. This means the enemies of the prophet have launched a very serious onslaught on the world of Islam. What is certain is that America's hand is clearly visible in all these crimes. What should be done now?

"America has come to believe that it can be the unrivaled bully in this international arena and everywhere on land and sea. It feels justified in inspecting a ship that

one country has sent to another country. What is your status that permits you to inspect a ship? It is at this point that China, North Korea, Pakistan, and other similar countries should think and reconsider their ties with America.

"The agreements they sign under the name of nuclear disarmament are a good idea only if they are telling the truth. But they are telling lies. First America and Israel should abandon their nuclear weapons. When their own nuclear weapons are destroyed, then they can tell others not to pursue the manufacture of such weapons. But now they sit there and promptly discredit any country that wishes to do anything, through allegations that that country is planning to manufacture nuclear weapons. They wish to threaten Iran under the pretext that Iran is going to manufacture nuclear weapons. Such allegations can be made against anyone very easily. Making allegations does not cost anything. They are exploiting the weapon of allegations, lies, calumny, blackmail, and propaganda.

"They create an explosion somewhere and then arrest anyone they wish. They make allegations against anyone they wish. Under the allegations that an assassination attempt was going to be made against so and so in such and such a place, they arrest this man and that man and accuse him of planning to carry out an assassination. No security will be left to mankind with this. What state and what person can feel secure that tomorrow an allegation will not be made against him and will not be used as an excuse to confront him and attack him? America has come to believe in this.

"What is certain is that one should pull out the fang of this giant snake. This fang can be pulled out, and this is not too difficult. All it needs is some brave men to come to the arena. Such men are found in Islamic societies among the Muslim youth, among these offspring of Friday prayers, and among those brought up at the front of battles between right and wrong—that is to say, the Hezbollah and Basij youth, whether in this country or in others.

"This task can be accomplished very easily. Of course, it involves certain costs, and blood must be sacrificed. One must do what the prophets and what Imam Husayn did. [passage omitted]

Today they are endangering the earth with their corruption. Somehow and from somewhere they have to be stopped, and these days you can only vest hope in Islam and in Muslims, who are the only people capable of doing something. [passage omitted]"

Syria Unwilling To 'Concur With Every Compromise'

NC2309122593 Tehran Voice of the Islamic Republic of Iran First Program Network in Persian 0345 GMT 23 Sep 93

[Commentary by News Commentaries Group]

[Text] Syrian President Hafiz al-Asad arrived in Alexandria yesterday and conferred with his Egyptian counterpart. Most political analysts believe the compromise between the Arab governments and the Zionist regime is the salient issue being discussed in these talks.

After the accord was signed between the PLO and the Zionist regime, Hafiz al-Asad maintained silence or neutrality. But, in his first remarks to the press in Egypt, he attacked the accord and Yasir 'Arafat, the PLO executive committee chairman. He did leave the path open to the possibility of Syria doing something similar.

Political analysts believe al-Asad's visit to Egypt merits attention from two aspects: First, Egypt's role in achieving a compromise between Arab countries and Israel and second, Syria's important position in any kind of compromise in the region.

The recent diplomatic moves by Egypt, coupled with the visits to Egypt by 'Arafat, the PLO executive committee chairman, and the Zionist regime's Prime Minister Rabin, and the meeting in Cairo of the foreign ministers of the Arab League, which supports the PLO- Israeli accord, highlight Egypt's pivotal role in extending the Camp David policies in the region. This is why Hafiz al-Asad's visit to Cairo can be viewed only in the context of the role allotted to Egypt.

Another aspect that should be considered in respect of al-Asad's visit to Egypt is Syria's role in every agreement. It was said much earlier that war with Israel is impossible without Egypt and peace with Israel without Syria is improbable. Syria's importance in every compromise stems from its enjoying an important geopolitical position in the region and increasing influence in Lebanon and among the Palestinian organizations. As these factors start to move, Syria could seriously disrupt the trend of compromise.

Opposition by the highest personality in Syria to the PLO accord indicates that although Damascus has accepted the principle of a compromise with the Zionist regime by participating in the Washington peace talks, it is not prepared to concur with every compromise.

GCC Asked To Show 'Prudence' in Ties With Tehran

NC2409080993 Tehran KAYHAN INTERNATIONAL in English 20 Sep 93 p 2

[Editorial: "Sovereignty Over Persian Gulf Islands"]

[Text] It was early this month, September 8 to be exact, that the Islamic Republic first decided to reaffirm its sovereignty over three disputed islands in the Persian Gulf in no uncertain terms: A Foreign Affairs Ministry spokesman referred to the UAE [United Arab Emirates] claims on the islands as illusory and repetitive, arguing that "these islands have always belonged to Iran and will always do so."

Such an important policy statement by a spokesman might leave doubts or ambiguities in the minds of some as to the degree of commitment behind it. To set the record straight in this connection, and remove any doubts, Foreign Minister Velayati took up the subject himself again this past Friday.

Speaking to a gathering of Revolutionary Guards commanders, Mr. Velayati said Iran would go to any length necessary to keep the three islands, and that Iran "would not retreat from even one millimeter of them." His statement in relations to these islands seem to have been a studied response and carefully considered beforehand. Although the statement might offend some Arab Persian Gulf states, they now have at least a firm picture of Iran's stance in connection to the issue and they can consequently decide and act accordingly.

Iran and the United Arab Emirates have been locked for some times in a dispute over three strategic Persian Gulf islands. Of the three Abu Musa, near the Strait of Hormuz, has been referred to as the gateway to the waterway. Thus its value to either country.

The establishment of close and amicable ties with the Arab states of the Persian Gulf has been at the center of Iran's foreign policy, and the Islamic Republic has gone out of its way to help cultivate trust and understanding in the place of the mutual suspicion that existed before. It is regretted that now that the ties have taken a turn for the better, quarrels and contrived claims should set back their pace.

The Islamic Republic must have a reason for having made such a firm policy statement and for having decided to draw the line somewhere. Ever since the collapse of the previous regime and the victory of the Islamic Revolution, Iran has been witnessing claims after claims by the Persian Gulf Arab states. It began with their campaign to change the millennia years old term "Persian Gulf" to the misnomer "Gulf". It was next their jumping behind Iraq in support of Baghdad's claims that parts of the Arabic speaking southern Iran actually belonged to it. And it has been a couple of years since the emirates began questioning Iran's ownership of the strategic islands. If past performance is any indication and the trend continues, before long we might witness additional claims.

The Islamic Republic views the whole claims on the islands as being politically motivated. And that the UAE is very conveniently falling into the trap set by the Brits after their departure from the islands in 1971, and inciting by the enemies of Iran who would rather not see stability and claim in Iran and for that matter the whole of the Persian Gulf region.

Before jumping to conclusion and begin issuing anti-Iran and pro-UAE declarations, as they did at the height of the Iraqi-imposed war, the GCC [Gulf Cooperation Council] countries should view the whole thing prudently. Despite the sophisticated war equipment in their arsenals, the consequences of heightened tension or confrontation between Iran and them would be in no one's interests, not even that of the industrial world.

Even though Mr. Velayati made a categorical statement on the question of the islands' ownership, he did not slam the door on negotiations. These islands did not appear in the waterway overnight. There is a (political) history behind them going back several thousand years, specially ever since the coming of the Portuguese to the Persian Gulf. By relying on the available documents, each side can make its points, and points based on logic and reason will always stand.

Room for Improved Ties With France Seen

NC2409082993 Tehran TEHRAN TIMES in English 15 Sep 93 p 2

[Editorial: "Relations Could Be Better..."]

[Text] French Foreign Ministry Secretary General Serge Biodevaix will arrive in Tehran today to hold talks with high-ranking Iranian officials. This is not, in fact, the first such meeting at this level between the two country's Foreign Ministry officials. The former French deputy foreign minister has had regular, direct negotiations with his Iranian counterpart Mahmud Va'ezi in Paris and Tehran.

All in all, Tehran-Paris relations can be termed good. But looking at the present world conditions and the region's power equations, there is room for more cordial ties. Apparently, the French leaders have a sound understanding of the prevalent situation. They are well aware that due to a not-so-small blunder, their leaders put all their eggs in one basket, Iraq, and sustained considerable losses: a political defeat coupled with billions of francs in financial losses for French factories.

In France, some are still optimistic and say their dues are stored "in freezers" and if needed will one day be brought out. But following the U.S. troops' deployment in the Persian Gulf, France will, in the not-too-distant future, face serious tangles in this region unless it aims at full endorsement of and adherence to the American "New World Order." Consequently, the pump appears primed for the expansion and promotion of relations at all levels, even though certain hurdles might be along the way.

The incarceration of an Iranian Foreign Ministry's low rank staff member—whose innocence is known even to the French—has in itself become a setback to the mutual relations. As per the economic ties, the French complain of the unfavorable level of trade relations. A French diplomat has mentioned something that inspires reflection. He said: "Our trade relations with Iran are at the level of Iran's trade relations with Britain." Actually, in view of Britain's overt hostility towards Iran in all international forums why [previous word published in italics] should the situation be like this?

Pakistan

Qureshi Stresses Nuclear Program 'Capped'

BK2409085793 Islamabad THE MUSLIM in English 24 Sep 93 pp 1, 10

[By Mohammad Saleh Zaafir]

[Text] Islamabad, Sept 23—Pakistan has stopped and capped its nuclear programme after reaching a point. Disclosing this, caretaker Prime Minister Moin Qureshi has assured that "we are not making an actual nuclear device."

In an hour long interview with a panel of three senior journalists at the Prime Minister House on Thursday [23 September], the Prime Minister expressed hope that the Pressler Amendment was bound to to in mounths to come. Col Ikramullah Mir, Press Secretary to the Premier was also present.

[Word indistinct] upon the country's nuclear programme and the notorious Presser Amemdment, the caretaker Prime Minister said that "I think that there is a growing recognition on the part of the United States of the fact that the Pressler Amendment has not been achieving its objectives." They thought that this would force Pakistan to roll back its nuclear programme but in fact it bad made it more difficult for Pakistan to consider such action, he said.

The Prime Minister said that the amendment had hardened the position of Pakistan because Pakistan was very weak in conventional military terms compared to India. It has become necessary for Pakistan to have an effective deterrent nuclear capability. He said that the amendment, by stopping all military supply to Pakistan, made as more weak and vulnerable which in turn made us more dependent on the nuclear option. "It had opposite effects", said the PM.

He said that New Delhi had developed an indigenous balistic missiles programme and we had no such domestic programme.

"I am confident that in a matter of months the US will realise that it made a mistake in passing the Pressler Amendment," he added.

To a query Mr Qureshi said that he had a lot of friends in the United States in positions of authority, and on the basis of his conversations with them he was quite confident that the public opinion was in favour of discarding the Amendment.

Responding to a question about the paradox that a non-elected government had succeeded in delivering what two successive governments had failed at, the Prime Minister said that Pakistan had not had as yet a truly strong and broad-based government. "We have still to build an efficient and democratic system, by electing good representatives through fair elections." He said that in due course of time he was sure that we would have democratic system, one which was very responsible.

"I think there is a lot to be done. We have just started economic and institutional reforms, but a great deal has to be done and I am very hopeful that the elected government will continue this task," he said.

He said that over a period of time the people of Pakistan would realise that these allegations were nothing but nonsense.

Mr Moin Qureshi said that the Pakistan Embassy in Washington had been issuing him a passport for the last 25 years but at no point was he asked to submit a national ID card. If a card was required for a passport to be issue, and still the embassy was issuing passporst without asking for an ID card, the explanation should be sought from the embassy, said the PM.

Commenting on the absence of women in the caretaker cabinets, the Prime Minister said that a criteria was established for appointing a minister but unfortunately no woman was found fitting the criterion. He said that he selected one or two ladies for the cabinet but some political parties had objections about them and resultantly he had to drop them from consideration.

Prime Minister Qureshi said that the government has asked all the banks to proceed with legal action against, the non-political defaulters as they were in majority. He said that the legislation had already been drafted to recover the money as land revenue, which would empower the authorities concerned to not only attach the property of the defaulters but also provide for sending defaulters to prison till the money was recovered in full.

Commenting on the visit of his Indian counterpart to China and Iran, Prime Minister Moin Qureshi said that Pakistan could not expect better relations with China and Iran than those that already existed. He said that Paksitan had no problem with the improvement of relations between India and China, and Iran and India.

He said that Pakistan welcomes the statement of the UN Secretary General offering mediation in the Kashmir issue. "Really, I would welcome assistance in this regard from any quarter." But Mr Qureshi said that India should stop its suppression of the Kashmiris in order to improve the situation, and that Pakistan could not remain indifferent to what was happerning in Indian occupied Kashmir.

To a query about the investigations into the death of General Asif Nawaz the Prime Minister hinted that the investigations of the case would be completed within the tenure of his government. He said that forensic experts from the United States, UK and France were expected to reach here soon to conduct the autopsy as demanded by the heirs of the former COAS [chief of the Army Staff].

The Prime Minister said that in case the experts expressed their inability to come here then the government could send them those specimans from the body of

the general which would be needed by the experts to determine the cause of death.

To another question, the Prime Minister did not agree with the questioner that in Pakistan the rich were becoming richer and the poor becoming poorer because of the market economy. He said that the rich had been becoming richer here for last 35 to 40 years because the rich could share power and could use their influence to make themselves richer, by exploiting the public exchequer and public assets. In addition the opportunities provided by public sector corruption had also made many people rich, said the PM.

The Prime Minister stressed the need of having a national programme to eradicate unemployment from the country and suggested radical changes in the educational system, which had been failing in producing skilled and educated peole. He pointed out that a garbage collector in the United States was earning more money than many persons in white collar jobs.

"We need to have vocational and technical training for our young people", he said, and stressed the need to establish small scale industries to accommodate a large number people in employment.

The Prime Minister ruled out the possibility of holding a referendum on any national issue during the days of his government.

"I came on the demand of the nation but if the nation needs me again then I will have to think twice about it," the caretaker Prime Minister said with a laugh.

Replying to another question, the Prime Minister said that the major steps taken by his government could not be reversed by the governments to follow because they were in the best interest of the country and they had been done openly.

To a question about accountability, the Prime Minister said that accountability was not a one time act, it was a process. Posing a counter question, Mr Qureshi asked how would you define and how would you achieve accountability? You have to establish certain tests, those tests have to be carried out honestly by some institutions, and then the results of those tests have to be made available to the public, who could judge them well.

When the Prime Minister's attention was drawn towards the deteriorating law and order situation, he confessed that "I have failed in bringing about significant improvements in law and order situation. I can assure you that this is one of the things that is very much on my mind."

He pointed out that some forces within and outside the country are interested in disrupting the situation prior to the elections, not because of they would like the present government to continue, but because they wanted to get the elections postponed to bring a blot on the name of Pakistan.

The Prime Minister said that in Pakistan lethal weapons were available in greater numbers than in any other settled country of the world. Here people are carrying kalashnikovs casually, lamented Mr Qureshi.

He said that some people by spreading terrorism were out to establish that Pakistan was again drifting into an undemocratic system. To a question, the Prime Minister did not rule out the possibility of involvement of some contenders for power in the worsening law and order situation.

The Prime Minister disclosed that the ordinance, providing for death sentence to persons found involved in drug trafficking had been sent to the President for promulgation. Some other ordinances had also been finalised for stricter punishments for criminals, he added.

To a question about the election results, the Prime Minister expressed the hope that the country would have a majority party government and it would not be a hung parliament.

"If there is a hung parliament, we will have a serious problem. I sincerely hope that if there is a hung parliament there would be some sort of coalition government between smaller and larger parties to give shape to a majority party," he said.

The Prime Minister impressed upon the major parties to opt to sink their differences and said that he did not find any major difference in their manifesto with reference to their economic and political policies. He was of the view, however, that a coalition of the major two parties would be unlikely. In the circumstances, they should respect the opposition and should not consider each other as an enemy, concluded the Prime Minister.

Mr Qureshi said that he would be available to play a role as mediator between the whichever two parties emerged as the largest after the elections, in the capacity of a private citizen. He made it clear that he would not accept any offer of public office even if both major parties asked for it.

When his attention was drawn to allegations from some quarters that he was an "American agent", the Prime Minister said that those making such allegations were mistaken because they considered him a potential political force. "I am not competing for anything in the political arena".

Iran's Borujerdi, Delegation Pay Official Visit

Entourage Arrives 23 Sep

LD2309143093 Tehran IRNA in English 1347 GMT 23 Sep 93

[Text] Islamabad, Sept. 23, IRNA—Deputy Foreign Minister for Asia-Pacific affairs, 'Ala'eddin Borujerdi, heading a delegation arrived here Thursday [23 September]. Borujerdi is to convey messages from President

Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani to Pakistan's acting president, Wasim Sajjad, and caretaker prime minister, Moin Ahmad Qureshi.

Upon arrival here Borujerdi told IRNA that he is also carrying a written message from Foreign Minister 'Ali Akbar Velayati for his Pakistani counterpart, Abdul Sattar.

Commenting on Tehran-Islamabad ties, Borujerdi said that both countries attach special importance to broadening of bilateral relations. He said that he will discuss with the Pakistani officials the latest developments in the region, Tehran-Islamabad ties as well as the recent visit to Tehran of Indian Prime Minister V.P. Narasimha Rao.

Borujerdi Meets Qureshi, Sajjad

BK2309152093 Islamabad PTV Television Network in English 1400 GMT 23 Sep 93

[Text] The deputy foreign minister of Iran, Dr. Ala-ed-Din Borujerdi, called on the prime minister, Mr. Moin Qureshi, at the prime minister's house today and conveyed the greetings of President Rafsanjani and reaffirmed close fraternal ties between Pakistan and Iran. The prime minister appreciated the visit of Mr. Borujerdi to brief Pakistan on the recent developments in the region, including the visit of the Indian prime minister, Mr. Narasimha Rao. Dr. Borujerdi assured the prime minister that relations between Pakistan and Iran was special and would not be affected by any other development in the region. The prime minister referred to human rights violations in Indian-held Kashmir and Dr. Borujerdi reaffirmed the traditional position of Iran on Kashmir issue. They also discussed bilateral and regional issues.

The deputy foreign minister, Dr. Ala-ed-Din Borujerdi, also called on the acting president, Mr. Wasim Sajjad. The president said Pakistan greatly values its brotherly relationship with Iran which will always remain a cornerstone of our foreign policy regardless of political changes. During the meeting, satisfaction was expressed from both sides at the depth and direction of bilateral cooperation in various fields.

More on Borujerdi, Sajjad Meeting

LD2309155293 Tehran IRNA in English 1434 GMT 23 Sep 93

[Text] Islamabad, Sept. 23, IRNA—Iran's deputy foreign minister for Asia-Pacific affairs, 'Ala'eddin Borujerdi, told the care taker Pakistani president, Wassim Sajjad, here Thursday [23 September] that Iran attaches especial importance to its relations with Pakistan.

Borujerdi, who arrived here today with a verbal message from President 'Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani for Sajjad, also expressed hope that the neighbouring Pakistan will be stronger and more stable than before.

On PLO-Israeli compromise deal, the Iranian official said that undoubtedly the agreement will not mean the end of the Palestinian issue. "The issue will come to an end only when Palestine is returned to its real owners," he added.

Sajjad lauded the Islamic Republic of Iran for its support for regional and world Muslims.

The care taker Pakistani president said further promotion of Islamabad-Tehran relations is a must and that his country attaches a special importance to its ties with Iran.

He added that the Holy Al-Quds [Jerusalem] is of vital importance for the world Muslims and expressed hope that the wish of Muslims in liberation of the Holy Al-Quds will be materialized.

Editorial Views Iranian Stand on Kashmir

BK2409081793 Rawalpindi NAWA-I-WAQT in Urdu 23 Sep 93 p 10

[Editorial: "Indian Propaganda About Kashmir—Muslim Countries Should Not Be Misled"]

[Text] Iranian President Hashemi-Rafsanjani has said that in view of the Muslim population in India, we want a solution to the Kashmir issue that does not affect India's relations with the Islamic world. The brotherly and friendly nation of Iran is among the countries whose leaders were the first to support the movement that began in occupied Kashmir in 1989 to free Kashmir and unite with Pakistan. As a mark of protest, Iran suspended the Indian foreign minister's visit. Subsequently, however, reports circulated that created the impression India had convinced Iran on the Kashmir issue and that the Iranian leadership, in contrast to their earlier stand, had started viewing the Kashmir issue as India's internal affair. After the Islamic revolution in Iran, the world's oppressed people and the Muslim minority, who were subjected to atrocities by the atheists, nurtured hope that Iran would help them and ensure their welfare. The Iranian leaders themselves expressed their resolve that they would consider the problem of the Islamic community as their own and that Iran would help Muslims wherever they were subject to oppression. No Muslim, regardless of where he comes from in the world, can be unaware of or remain aloof from the protracted anti-Muslim operations in India, both at the governmental and nongovernmental levels, and the atrocities being perpetrated by 500,000 troops in Kashmir.

UN resolutions have also termed the Indian intervention in Kashmir illegitimate. According to UN resolutions, Kashmir is a disputed territory whose people should have the opportunity to determine their fate. But a plebiscite has not been held in Kashmir because of India's insolence.

Iran has always supported these resolutions. Kashmiri freedom fighters and Pakistan enjoyed Iranian support on the two occasions when the issue led to war. The Kashmiri people started their current struggle when they failed to see a ray of hope in the UN resolutions and felt

that they could secure their independence from India only by their own strength. In the beginning, Iran openly sided with the Kashmiris in their struggle. Even now, Pakistan and the Kashmiri people expect the Islamic Republic of Iran to support them against the Brahman regime. The Kashmir problem is not an Indian internal affair. It has no justification for carrying out atrocities in Kashmir. The Indian leadership has even failed to convince Islam's worst enemies—the United States and the Western countries—about its military operations in occupied Kashmir. India's refusal to let members of Amnesty International and other human rights organizations enter occupied Kashmir also exposes its wicked motives and its guilty conscience. It is unfortunate for us that the Islamic world has thus far failed to notice the excesses being carried out against the Kashmiris. They are being punished for being Muslim. The atrocities will cease if the Kashmiris fulfill the desire of the Brahmans by forgetting their Islamic identity and amalgamating with India.

The Kashmiri people's struggle demands that the Islamic world—especially the friendly countries of Iran, Turkey, and Afghanistan—persuade India to allow the Kashmiri people the opportunity to determine their future as stipulated by UN resolutions and end the continuing reign of atrocities. The Indian prime minister is paying a visit to Iran at a time when the Kashmiris are fighting their last war of survival. After convincing China to some extent, India is now trying to pull other neighboring countries to its side with sugar-coated words. The intention is to seize Kashmir by obliterating the very existence of the Kashmiri people and striking a decisive blow against Pakistan. Therefore, the Iranian leadership should not vacillate. The Indian media is creating the impression that the Iranian leadership has described the Kashmir problem as India's internal affair, which means to a certain extent that the Iranians are ignoring the Kashmiri people's struggle. If it is not a misinterpretation—if it is fact—then it is very unfortunate. But if the fact is that India has created the wrong impression, the Iranian leadership should not only openly reject this impression but also speak to the Indian prime minister with harsh language, because India only understands such language. The impression that the Iranian leadership prefers India over Pakistan, and that instead of supporting the Kashmiri struggle it supports India, should be removed.

U.S. Said Seeking Return of Stingers From Militants

BK2209105593 Islamabad THE PAKISTAN OBSERVER in English 22 Sep 93 p 12

[Text] Karachi—Highly informed sources have disclosed the drive against drug-barons in tribal areas was a clandestine move by Americans just to get back the Stinger missiles from Afghan Mojahedin factions.

Talking to PAKISTAN OBSERVER, the Afghan Mojahedin leaders in Karachi explained the Americans were very much afraid of Stingers in Afghans' hands which were sold by them through Pakistan during a decade-long resistance movement against Russian aggression an Afghanistan. Since the end of war against Russia, the American authorities made various attempts to get back the left-over Stingers, including an abortive commando operation, but failed.

According to the American's estimate, there are more than 250 surface-to-air Stingers in the possession of different factions of Afghan Mojahidin. To buy back those all, they had even offered $100,000 a piece but had been refused.

It may be mentioned the present Afghan Prime Minister Golboddin had disclosed in 1988 that Stingers were rejected by the United States armed forces for the reason that the shoulder-fired missiles were too heavy to be carried by the American soldiers. Thus, the American Government, just to compensate the manufacturing of this arscual had pushed a lot of Stingers through Pakistan to the Afghan war fields here, the Afghan guerrillas took this burden on their strong and fundamentalist shoulders and downed a barrage of aggressive Russian aircraft which proved the last nail in their coffin.

This was quite unexpected for the American experts who had now realised the importance of Stingers. The sources further stated the Americans were afraid of the possible uses of Stingers in Jehad-e-Kashmir against the Indian air-attacks, transfer-of-the-fatal-ammunition to Central Asian Republics and Iran. Their third and foremost worry is behind their wish to declare Afghanistan a terrorist state like other few Muslim countries. In that case, the Afghan guerrillas would certainly blow up the American aircraft, anywhere in the world, with the help of these Stingers, the sources said. Therefore, the Americans are madly after those Stingers and even do not bother to use the drug-barons.